

England And Europe
vol-37



Librarian

Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library
Govt. of West Bengal



40 per cent. since every man must serve in the army. The trade 40 per cent. life may be, those men who have the naval expenditure or to serve in the commissioned ranks concludes afloat rank and file. Hence all the best brains in England are compelled to become officers. The men who in England would become judges, lawyers, surgeons, or civil engineers, are driven into the army, and men of energy and enterprise, finding that they are likely to rise, remain in the army. Hence civil professions only obtain those who find the army does not offer them a field for advancement, and it says much for the indomitable patience, capability, and self-denial of the German race, when it is considered how much good work has been done by German philosophers, German men of science, and German authors.

It is an accepted axiom everywhere that it is every man's duty to defend his country, but it by no means follows that he can defend his country more ably and more usefully in person than in purse. When we consider the enormous wealth of this country, the great trade and commerce that it possesses, and the terrible calamity that could fall upon us in case of a successful invasion by an enemy, it could not be considered that the £17,000,000 per annum paid for the maintenance of the army, and £10,000,000, or even the increased amount this year of £13,000,000, paid for the support of the navy, are ludicrously small premiums for the immense amount of national wealth the security of which is insured thereby. The conditions of our country are so different from Germany and from France, the nature of our society is so dissimilar, that it is most undesirable for a British military administrator to plagiarise the German system. No doubt in certain points it would be an advantage if it were imitated, but it would seem that one of the reasons of the uncertainty and inconsistency which characterize our military organization is due to the fact that a blind attempt has been made to follow too literally the German rule, without sufficient regard to the broad principles and wide considerations on which the German system was originally founded. When we have such splendid resources in voluntary soldiery, it appears almost culpable negligence on the part of our Government that this country should be practically living at the mercy of our enemies. Through blind heedlessness these resources are liable at any moment to be dispersed to the winds; through want of the ordinary administration and organization the whole system of our equipment, munitions, and arms, depends upon the issue of a single arsenal, from which it would be utterly impossible to obtain in time of sudden need the munitions necessary even if they should already held in its storehouses.

The naval and military authorities seldom reasonably spare upon the place their requirements before the country. The

has a not unreasonable distrust that the army and navy are mismanaged, and maintenance of these services will be foolish opposition of both the naval and military service to economy are well known, and prevent the taxpayers that reliance in their assertions which otherwise might be great advantage. They should remember that commerce must not be restricted or hampered to suit military demands. It is the duty of the naval and military services to defend commerce, however widely developed or wherever extended, and not to attempt to curtail commercial enterprise in order to make their duties more easy. Naval and military officers complain of the apathy and indifference of the public towards the necessity of improvement in the defence of the country and its colonies. But who are responsible for this apathy and indifference, if not the naval and military authorities themselves? Why do they not take the country into their confidence? Is it not the case that a Royal Commission sat for three years under the presidency of Lord Carnarvon, and has offered several recommendations which the Admiralty and War Office have studiously prevented from being in any way made public? The only conclusion which can be arrived at is that these recommendations are concealed, because for the sake of an unwise economy and for party purposes they have been ignored, as the public on being informed of what they are might have demanded that they should be carried out.

If it could be once settled, as it is believed that Lord Carnarvon's commission suggested it should be settled, what the functions of the navy and army are to be, what vessels should be stationed at different parts of the world, what forces should be maintained in India and in the colonies, and at the coaling stations, what depôts should be kept up, what reserves created, and what men should always be available at home—how to obtain the number of seamen and soldiers to fulfil our requirements would simply be a question of money, and how to utilise them correctly a matter of administration. It is admitted on all hands that our navy must be the first defence of the United Kingdom, the first defence of our colonies, and the link to keep communication between our colonies and the mother country. It must, too, protect our merchantmen from capture on the high seas. It is especially important, since a belligerent power has declared that rice is contraband of war, and consequently wheat, and all food-stuffs may equally be so declared; and if we were unable to obtain these supplies could not be obtained for this country in neutral territory. Within the last six months there has been so much agitation in the country with regard to the navy, that in last autumn session the Government were obliged to kick into bringing forward a supplementary estimate. It is necessary. The naval expenditure of other powers

750 per cent. since 1868. The population has grown 16 per cent., our trade 40 per cent., our merchant shipping 30 per cent., and our naval expenditure had been slightly diminished! Neither our ironclads afloat nor building have we that superiority which is necessary to make sure our command of the seas.

That our guns mounted on our ships are inferior, both in weight and power, to those of France and Italy, and that we have not one ironclad afloat armed with the new breech-loader in case of sudden war, is admitted on all hands. The French have better fighting-ships on the China station than we. The Chilian ironclads are stronger than our Pacific cruisers, and one new ironclad of Brazil could sweep our South American squadron off the sea. Our fast ocean cruisers available for the police of our maritime highways are so few that we could not allot three to each naval station. Yet we have close upon twenty thousand merchantmen scattered all over the world, and only twenty-four unarmoured ships of sufficient speed to cover them.

Our coaling stations at Hong Kong, Singapore, and other points are virtually unprotected. There is no dock in India where an ironclad could refit; and a man-of-war of the first class could not find no port for repair between Malta and Sydney. Our home harbours are not protected, and we have not sufficient trained men to man our fleet on a declaration of war, without drawing eight thousand from the reserve. Yet, although in December last Lord Northbrook in the House of Lords and Sir Thomas Brassey in the House of Commons proposed an addition of £3,100,000 for the improvement of the navy, £1,600,000 for naval ordnance, and £825,000 for coaling stations—altogether £5,525,000—it was agreed that the expenditure of this sum should be spread over five years, and up to the present time no contract for any of the new ships promised has yet been accepted, and the autumn programme is already threatened with serious curtailment under the pressure of the Treasury. No designs for any of the new vessels except those of the *Scout* class are yet ready, and will probably not be prepared before April; while some of the vessels most important for the defence of our commerce may even, with good fortune only, be completed in March, 1886.

The statements made by the officials of the Admiralty in Parliament in some respects require technical skill to understand, but on certain points any man of common sense can form his own opinion. It is evident that the supply of guns to our fleet is unsatisfactory, and the conversion of muzzle-loaders into breech-loaders should be soon enough undertaken. It is also clear that if the Admiralty had provided proper estimates for the naval necessities of 1886, they should not have been suddenly led into increasing those estimates in the autumn of that year, thus throwing a large expenditure upon the country on account of certain articles by anonymous journalists, and

giving up the government of the country into the irresponsible writers. If, on the other hand, the Admiralty is right in making an increase in the latter part of 1884, it is clear that the estimates for the year, which were presented to Parliament in the spring, were inadequate, parsimonious, and not calculated to maintain the safety and welfare of the empire.

There is another point which is equally unmistakable, whatever may be the state of our vessels, the men of our navy are no means so strong in numbers as those of even one other nation—the French. It appears that the entire strength of the British navy, including seamen of the fleet, royal marine, and boys in training, naval reserve, and naval academy, does not number 78,000 men, while France for a navy of the same power counts on 172,000 men, of whom are seamen. The Italian navy, in round numbers, consists of 210,000 men, of whom 148,000 are seamen. In the present state of gun and complicated machinery on board men of war, it is hardly possible to recruit our navy in great numbers from the marine in case of sudden hostilities, especially as it is now largely manned by foreigners.

It appears very desirable that some effort should be made to create a sea militia, such as the sea-fencibles which were raised in 1805 when Napoleon threatened this country with invasion. At that time there were 26,000 sea-fencibles and 3,000 boats enrolled. As the fishing population in this country numbers 122,000 there should be no difficulty in raising a sea militia. With regard to material, some naval officers declaim against the construction of vessels with unarmoured ends; others hold that it is well to concentrate the armour to cover certain vulnerable points, and that vessels constructed on this principle will float longer than those on the lines advocated by their opponents. These are technical matters, but we can all see that the development of artillery and of naval armour has reduced the number while increasing the size of battleships; so it has come to pass that the vessels available for the protection of widely distant points of importance, and for operations on our far extended and still extending commercial routes, have become fewer than before.

The duties of the fleet in case of war are defined to be as follows:—1. To act in masses upon the enemy wherever that enemy is to be found. 2. To protect the lines of commercial communication. 3. To defend all the defence of the coasts of the colonies, and of the coast of these islands. But it appears that if this country is not to be greatly weakened by any war, or by the threat of war, more than this must be expected from the British fleet. It would seem to be absolutely necessary that our fleet should be strong enough not only to fight battles with an enemy's fleet, and to drive off hostile

~~The~~ whom our men-of-war may accidentally come into
~~the~~ at to blockade every hostile vessel and prevent her from
~~the~~ the sea. If even individual cruisers like the *Alabama* are
 to keep the sea and molest our commerce, not only would
 enormous losses be caused to the country, but our carrying trade
 might be diverted to neutral bottoms; and possibly never return
 to this country at all. There is seldom sufficient food in this country
 for the needs of the population for even a few months, and before
 harvest sometimes the supply is only sufficient for a few weeks. It
 is therefore absolutely essential that these supplies should be brought
 into the country without hindrance; and on account of our commer-
 cial necessities even if we were compelled, as Mr. Cobden said, to
 devote £100,000,000 to the task, that sum should be spent to keep
 the navy strong enough to drive every enemy's vessel off the sea.

It was only when hostile fleets were blockaded at the end of the
 great French war that the commerce of this country was enabled to
 be carried out in safety. The distances at which our fleet would have
 to operate are now much more extended. It may happen that the
 blockade of a fleet some thousands of miles away, for instance on the
 Amoor, may be as practicable and even a more thorough defence of
 the country than an action fought in the English Channel. During
 the Crimean war the seas all over the world were as safe to British mer-
 chantmen as the Firth of Clyde, because the Russian fleet could not keep
 the sea. It must also be borne in mind that it is of the first import-
 ance, not only for military purposes, but in the interest of commerce,
 that the telegraphic communication with our colonies and countries
 of export should be uninterrupted. Cruisers would be required con-
 stantly to be patrolling the principal lines of submarine cables in
 order to prevent these being raised and cut by hostile cruisers. Since
 in future wars the fleet must keep the sea for a considerable time to
 maintain blockades, it will also be necessary that means should be
 taken for coaling vessels while afloat, and for this reason colliers must
 also be protected. When we reflect that our fleet must do these
 duties, that it must watch nearly 100,000 miles of communication, and
 guard the enormous traffic which in at least 20,000 vessels is passing
 continually to and fro (this number of vessels is certainly not exag-
 gerated, since the number borne in *Lloyd's Weekly Index*, which
 excludes coasting and various special trades, is nearly 20,000); when
 we consider that the fleet must carry stores and reinforcements
 to our garrisons abroad, and supplies and munitions to our coaling
 stations, which, without relief and stores, must perish; when we also
 remember that the fleet must protect the coast line of Great Britain
 and Ireland, 3,000 miles in extent, in which there are between fifty
 and sixty vulnerable points—we must see that the fleet would, even if
 twice or three times as numerous as at present, be too small for the

work required from it, and that no effort should be lost to the improvement of its numerical efficiency.

It follows that the only manner in which the interests of the country can be maintained in future, during time of war, is by having a fleet so powerful and so crushingly superior to any possible combination which could be brought against it, that no enemy's cruisers could keep the sea, run into our ports and levy contributions, or cut off our merchantmen on the high seas.

Let it not be forgotten that, however numerous and efficient our fleet may be, it cannot keep the sea for any length of time unless it has behind it dockyards in which it may be refitted and repaired; arsenals whence it may draw its ammunition and its stores; coal depôts whence it may derive its motive power; and hospitals to which it may remove its sick and wounded. All these must necessarily be placed beyond the reach of an enemy's attack, and, therefore, must be covered by fortifications which would prevent a sudden assault and render a regular siege necessary.

It is also evident that our commercial communications are of no value if our country, which must be the base of the whole of our operations, is itself not safe from attack. This is not the case at the present time. Not only are our commercial ports not sufficiently strong to resist bombardment and contribution by any hostile cruiser, however small, but London itself is an open town, and within three days' march of the coast. If London fell, and the enemy were in possession of the Bank of England and the Royal Exchange, the pulse of commerce throughout the country must cease to beat, and the threat of clearing out the Bank cellars, burning the City, and setting fire to all the shipping in the Thames, would compel this country to sue for peace on any terms without venturing to strike another blow. Nor is this all—with London must fall Woolwich Arsenal, which is the only arsenal whence a single round of ammunition or a single field-gun can be turned out. It would certainly then appear that it is necessary that some means should be taken for throwing works around London, in accordance with the recommendations which many years ago were made by the Defence Commission. Such works, to cover the enormous province of houses which constitutes London, must be fortresses, not mere forts, and should contain within their area the arsenal at Woolwich.

The first military writer of the present day, Sir Edward Hamley, is of opinion that it would not be necessary to construct forts in the neighbourhood of London, but that positions could be taken up and prepared beforehand, which, manned by the Volunteers, could repel an invader without the cost or inconvenience of permanent works. Even in the face of this high authority it may, however, be submitted that troops, especially troops who have not been long trained or

volunteers. It is worthy of consideration whether the fleet should not be thrown up at the expense of the rates, subsidies or grants granted from the imperial funds. Submarine mines combined with shore batteries would be very useful. These are not costly, and could be put down in time of need. The defences for harbours of primary importance might consist of shore batteries and submarine mines, supplemented by guns and torpedo boats. Those of secondary importance by similar batteries of lighter armament and submarine mines, supplemented by torpedo boats. These batteries might defend the vulnerable points, and free the fleet from anxiety with regard to them, giving it liberty of action elsewhere, but they would not be in any sense strategic harbours, *i.e.* harbours in convenient positions, easy of access and well defended, in which any fleet could find means of refitting and of coaling. On the south coast, indeed, there are good harbours of this nature, such as Portsmouth, Portland, and Plymouth. Falmouth might be easily formed into a strong port; and there is a proposal to form a strategic harbour at the Skerries, near Start Point. On the west coast there are Milford Haven and Holyhead; and it is possible that by means of strong fortresses near Belfast, on the Mull of Cantyre, near Cork, and at Milford, the whole of the Irish Channel might be rendered impassable for an enemy, and there the whole of the British mercantile marine could lie, in case of necessity, without the fear of being touched. But on the east coast, which is possibly the most vulnerable, there is no place of refuge. In a coast line of five hundred and sixty miles, between Dover and the Forth, there is no harbour accessible in all weathers. Harwich is small, and, though strongly fortified, can only be made in certain weathers, and has not sufficient water for an ironclad of the first class. Yarmouth Roads are shoaling; the Humber lies open to the sea, and is not safe for coaling in an east wind. The Tyne is impracticable for vessels of deep draught. A strategic harbour of refuge is very desirable upon the east coast, alike for military and commercial and philanthropic reasons.

Over against the eastern coast of England lie the important fortified harbours of Cronstadt and Sveaborg on the one side, and of Kiel and Wilhelmshafen on the other; and for the same reason that Portland was placed on the south coast as a counterpoise to Cherbourg, it would seem prudent that some harbour, such as the harbour of refuge proposed at Filey, should be established on our eastern coast, especially as at Wilhelmshafen there is more wharfage facility for embarking troops and munitions of war than in all our dockyards put together. Dover is indeed admirably fitted from its position as a post of observation to prevent a juncture of hostile fleets and to cover the entrance to the English Channel from the North Sea, but Dover cannot command the coast of our island from the English Channel to the Firth of Forth, especially as at present no post of observation

ENGLAND AND EUROPE.

The ~~for~~ ^{er} for war vessels exists in the North of Scotland, although the Sound might easily be converted into one.

to the west coast, works might be constructed to bar the entrance to the Clyde as well as to defend the harbour of refuge at Holyhead. On the coast of Ireland, Cork is a strong point; and upon the northern coast Lough Foyle might be easily defended, as well as, possibly, Bantry Bay.

With regard to posts abroad, these chiefly are important as coaling stations and refitting harbours.

These points should be selected with reference to both the needs of men-of-war and of the mercantile marine. The question of docks, in consideration of that subject, is very serious, and it does not seem that England stands in a good position with regard to it. Many foreign yards, which were sufficient for the necessities of wooden vessels, are obsolete when ironclads require them.

The British Admiralty divide the waters of the world into nine portions for naval stations. These are:—(1) The Channel Station, which, for refitting and coaling, may rely upon home ports. (2) The Mediterranean Station, which covers the direct road to India, Australia, and China, by the Suez Canal. It is provided with two strongly fortified stations, Gibraltar and Malta, but some port appears to be required at Port Said. (3) The North American Station is fairly provided for. In the north there is the fortified harbour of Halifax, in mid-ocean Bermuda strongly fortified, while in the south there are Jamaica and Antigua, fortified or being fortified. Telegraphic communication is much needed on this station. There is no telegraph to Bermuda, and Jamaica is dependent upon either the United States or Havanna for communication with London. (4) On the South American Station there is only the Falkland Islands. (5) At the Cape Station coaling places fairly secure may be found at St. Helena and Ascension, Sierra Leone or Cape Coast; but a station out at sea here is much required, and it is unfortunate that the Cape de Verd Islands are not available. (6) The Indian Station has a fortified harbour at Bombay, with ample means for refitting; Aden, strongly fortified, secures the outlet of the Red Sea; and Trincomalee is fortified. Mauritius has a fortified harbour at Port Louis, but its value as a refitting station is very small in these days. (7) The Australian Station is very badly provided for. The nearest coaling places to Australia are Ceylon and Singapore, both over 4,000 miles distant from Melbourne. A station could be formed at King George's Sound, 1,200 miles distant from Melbourne. Melbourne has facilities for docking large ironclads, and is protected, through colonial enterprise, with strong works of modern construction, aided by guns and torpedo boats; so also is Sydney, 650 miles to the eastward. (8) The China Station centres round Hong Kong,

which requires fortification. Singapore connects Hong Kong, the Ceylon, and is the centre of an important trade. In this direction either station is well provided; but towards the East there is no coaling station or port of refuge nearer than Australia towards the south or Vancouver's Island eastwards. The great lines of steamers which trade in these waters have established depôts for coal at Thursday Island; and it would appear that some coaling stations which should be available in war should be established on the long line between Hong Kong and Sydney, of about 6,000 miles in length. (9) The Pacific Station is the farthest from Great Britain and widest in extent. On it the only port is the naval port of Vancouver, which has coal-fields in its vicinity.

The coaling stations on these foreign stations are not satisfactory as far as fortifications go, and probably it would require an amount of at least £3,000,000 to place them in a satisfactory condition; but this amount is little when we consider what enormous risk is at present run, not only by shipowners, underwriters, and merchants, but by the community at large, from the danger of supplies of food, upon which this country depends, being cut off.

Fortresses are of little use—indeed, of no use, unless there are troops of sufficient numerical strength to hold them. Unfortunately, the British army, although much improved of late years, and although it now possesses a reserve which formerly was non-existent, is not numerically strong enough for the duties required of it, especially when, as at the present time, over 20,000 men are locked up in the valley of the Nile, and 24,000 in Ireland. The army in England and Scotland at the present time consists of about 59,000 regular troops not under orders for foreign service; of 24,000 regular troops in Ireland, who can hardly be removed from that island; of 24,000 in foreign stations (exclusive of Egypt, the Soudan, and India); of 22,000 in Egypt and the Soudan, or under orders (of these, 15,000 are already there and 7,000 on the way); 60,000 in India; and two West Indian regiments of Negroes, numbering about 1,700 of all ranks. There are also about 34,500 in the first class reserve, 7,000 in other reserves, and a militia reserve of 26,000. In case of a complication, no troops could be called out except those in England and Scotland and the reserve—a total of 126,500. From this total, however, must be deducted all sick men and recruits—about 25,000—leaving only 101,500 available for the greatest emergency. With regard to the militia, its establishment is 142,000, but the actual strength is about 107,000. Of these, 26,000 belong to the militia reserve, already counted in the regular army; absentees and deserters number 11,000; recruits, 18,000: so that only 52,000 is the total force of militia that can be depended upon in case of war. Thus only 153,500 men can be brought together. Of these, garrisons abroad will require 40,000 to fill them up; the arsenals and military ports,

ulars, even supposing that volunteers form the chief part of the defence, in addition to 28,000 pensioners and 30,000 militia; the commercial ports would require, in addition to the volunteers, 10,000 regulars and 8,000 militia. These, taken all together, number 28,000. Taking that number from 153,500, there remains only 125,500 for the movable army, a force totally inadequate to take the field with any prospect of success against an invading force—which would not certainly be less than 120,000 men—or with which to conduct any offensive expedition into an enemy's country.

If the views expressed above be correct, it appears, as a result of the investigation that has been made into our power of defending the vast masses of imperial wealth and comfort which are placed in charge of the Government of this country, a large available body of splendid raw material in the shape of men for any imperial purpose of defence or attack can be obtained from the mother country and from the colonies by merely paying for them, as either seamen or soldiers, at the ordinary rates commanded in the labour market. Yet this enormous resource is paralysed and impotent on account of serious drawbacks in our administration, organization, and mechanical appliances. Our vessels are not sufficiently numerous to fulfil the demands that, in case of war, must be made upon the navy. The guns with which they are armed are not only inefficient in numbers, but of obsolete pattern, and inferior in power to those of foreign navies. Our dockyards are too few and too far apart, and their fortifications are insufficient. A considerable reserve of seamen and marines is required to place our vessels in a thorough fighting condition. Our arsenals are totally inadequate to our needs. It is absurd to suppose that the whole of the volunteers—the whole of the troops who must take the field in case of the threat of an invasion—and the whole of the requirements of the colonies, could be met by Woolwich Arsenal. Even if there were stores in abundance within the arsenal gates, the time required for their issue would make it utterly impossible to equip one quarter of the volunteers alone who would be ready to take the field, within a time sufficient to allow them to enter upon a campaign with any useful result.

Till the middle of the present century, wars were as a rule preceded by long diplomatic negotiations; and the difficulties of moving troops made many weeks elapse before armies came into collision. Steam and electricity have altered all this. Wars are now quick in their beginning and rapid in their decision. The nation that is found asleep must suffer severely. Our statesmen seem to trust to good fortune and not to good management. Not only are they timorous of incurring any financial responsibility, but even the most ordinary precautions which might be taken without expenditure are neglected.

H. M. HOZIER.

II.—THE ARMED STRENGTH OF ENGLAND.

THE Intelligence Department has issued from time to time books full of elaborate detail, called *The Armed Strength of Germany*, of Austria, and the rest of the great military Powers. Even the smaller Powers have not been left unnoticed. There is an *Armed Strength of the Netherlands*, but among them all appears no *Armed Strength of Great Britain*. This seems a rather remarkable oversight, seeing that no such gap appears in the archives of foreign Powers. They have their statistics of the British Army carefully compiled and edited with such accuracy as is possible when they are dealing with a nation which does not know its own strength. As a matter of fact, their military statistics are often wrong, and for the curious reason that, as we English have no reticence at all on military matters, the Press teems with so-called facts relating to the Army absolutely irreconcilable with each other.

The puzzled condition of mind in which foreign observers stand would matter little, were it not that the general opinion of officers and of the Service papers is uttered in no uncertain tone, and is pessimistic in the extreme. Some three or four years ago a paper appeared purporting to be written by an Austrian officer, and treating the whole question with true German profundity. The conclusion arrived at was that under no circumstances could we place more than 18,000 men in the field for a foreign expedition. Shortly afterwards we sent some 40,000 to Egypt and smashed Arabi with such remarkable speed and facility that our foreign critics declared the victory to have been won by gold. It is worth while just now to remember one or two facts, real facts, not simple declarations that matters are so and so. On the 24th July, 1882, the Government brought forward a vote of credit in the House. On the 25th the Queen issued a proclamation calling out a portion of the Reserves. On the 27th the vote of credit was passed. On the 30th the First Scots Guards sailed for Alexandria as the head of the Expeditionary Force; the last battalion sailed twelve days later, and arrived at Alexandria on the 21st of August. Thus, from the starting of the head of the column to the arrival of the tail at Alexandria, the time occupied was twenty-three days, including both the days of departure and arrival. On the 13th of September the battle of Tel-el-Kebir was fought, and Cairo was occupied on the 14th. Conceive the feelings of "An Austrian Officer" at such a stroke as this—all in direct contradiction to those laborious statistics collected and collated with so much care and skill.

The same pessimistic turn is adopted by speakers and writers on the military condition of India, and has no doubt had a direct influence on the conduct of Russia. It is impossible to suppose that such a weak and overgrown empire would have had the audacity to push her outposts within the territory which she knows is claimed by us for a nation under our protection, were it not that she believed us to be in a condition of weakness which must forbid bold action. If the tension results in war, it will be directly due to the persistent pessimism which has underrated our military resources, maligned our troops, and represented the British Empire as almost defenceless both by land and sea. On the other hand, there is danger in that official optimism which has, for many a year, refused to recognise the possibility of great wars, starved the Army and Navy, and left to be executed on the spur of the moment measures which all who know war and its lessons declare to be precautions which ought to be taken in time of peace. This strange carelessness has been common to all governments, Liberal and Conservative alike, and has given some colour to the assertions of the pessimists. Springing from a disbelief in the possibility of great wars, which rested on no better foundation than that it seemed so odd that there should be, this carelessness has taken such a hold on all the governing classes that every Minister of War has shrunk from the responsibility of insisting on a proper expenditure on military preparations. When the Ministry set a certain tone to the departments, the very small men who, with few exceptions, form the class of minor official, have not the courage to insist or resign. There is a feeble protest or two, and then love of place and the fear of falling into disfavour close their mouths. To tell superiors, on whose pleasure depend promotion and emoluments, that they are acting unpatriotically requires the courage and character of a Gordon, and the world has few Gordons.

The first, but not by any means the most important, question is the number of men actually available for the regular army in case of war with a great Power. For certainty of calculation no estimate is so complete as that of the Inspector-General of Recruiting, because he gives not so much what is provided for, but what actually exists on a certain day—the 1st January. He explains that the particular date tells rather against than in favour of the war-strength, because at that time a number of men arrive from India for discharge, and, though their services will not be lost, since they only pass into the Reserve, it is not permitted to recruit men to take their place till they are actually gone. The effect of this would, however, be comparatively trifling, and may be passed over. The actual strength of the force available on the 1st January of this year—1885—without counting the native army in India or the troops possessed by different colonies was—

Non-commissioned officers and men actually serving in the ranks	181,008
First-class Army Reserve, all trained men in the best period of life	39,224
Militia Reserve, consisting of partially trained men, always available for any war service	30,813
Total	<u>251,045</u>

There are other reserves, but on the whole they can hardly be counted upon for efficient service abroad, immediately on the outbreak of a war. The main fact to lay hold of here is that the War Office has at its disposal more than 250,000 men. The pessimists will say at once—First, that they don't see that number of men anywhere. Second, that what they do see are mostly recruits, some of them immature lads. Third, that the modern British soldier is degenerate. The official optimists will say—First, that such a number seems sufficient for the purposes of England. Second, that the accusation of carelessness falls to the ground.

Let us first see what is to be said to the hypochondriacal school. Whatever may be the sins of English officials, they do not write lying reports. If Major-General Buller reported that there were in the Army on the 1st January more than 250,000 men, it is as certain that the men were there as that the stars are in the heavens, even though a liver attack may dim the eyes of some of us to their multitude and their glory. But to begin with, the Reserves, who are the finest-grown men in the army, are of course invisible as soldiers till called out. Who knows but that even the *St. James's Gazette* is entertaining some of them in its office unawares? Then, of the 180,000 and odd troops with the colours, there are in Egypt just about as many as the force which we produced after much travail for the Crimean war. The Mediterranean fortresses hold heavy garrisons of strong battalions, and in the East, including India, Hong Kong, and other places, there are between 60,000 and 70,000. Ireland, unhappily, detains far too many; and the old idea of leaving the Cape to take care of itself has fallen through. We are all but at war there. With one war on our hands, a military occupation of Ireland, and a small affair at the Cape, we have not called out a single man of the Reserves. It would be marvellous if the force at home did not look rather weak. And once again, it must be stated for the thousandth time that the home battalions, except those of the 1st Army Corps, which are all either in Egypt or the Mediterranean, are not designed by the present army organization to be strong.

The answer to the second assertion is, that as 35,653 recruits enlisted last year, there could not possibly be in the Army on the 1st January, 1885, more than that number of men under one year's service. This is a small proportion of 250,000, but it looks large because all the recruits are at home, and therefore show in over-

whelming proportion to the home battalions on a peace strength. Cross the Channel, and you will see rawness in every army, though not to the same extent. To the third charge, that the modern British soldier is degenerate, the best reply has been given by the splendid behaviour of the troops in Egypt and the Soudan. Their deeds are so fresh in all memories that they need not be enumerated here. But it is worth while to observe that they have shown themselves as capable on the river as on land, and as brilliant in attack as steady in defence against immense odds. Their calm steadiness under fire has been worthy of old traditions, and the hand-to-hand struggles in which they have beaten their agile foes have been nothing short of heroic. Great toil in hot weather has been borne with perfect good humour and physical power of endurance. At the end of a series of forced marches, the men of Stewart's column, about one battalion strong—weary, athirst, more than decimated, and suffering under the loss of their commander—met the savage enemy with hearty cheers, forced their way onwards to the Nile, and constrained the Arabs, though much superior in number, to retreat or shut themselves up in Metenneh. Now, the men who did these things were fair average specimens of the British soldier. With the exception of the Mounted Infantry they were not picked men; and the advance of the column under General Earle, its gallant attack on the heights, its movement up the river and successful retirement, showed exactly the same qualities as have immortalised Stewart's "tiny square." The hypochondriacs, bent upon proving degeneracy, have since said that these regiments were well weeded out before leaving England. It so happens that a great part of them did not come from England at all, but from Egypt, and that there had been serious complaints as to the large proportion of recruits which had been sent out to those battalions in Egypt. With regard to the battalions sent at different times from England, it is said that they dropped numerous men who were too young and untrained for war. Of course they did, and there never has been a time when either English or foreign battalions did not undergo a process of weeding when leaving home for active service. A German battalion when mobilized drops at least one-third of its strength, and fills up to a higher strength from the reserve. The English battalions dropped a smaller proportion, yet sailed as strong battalions without calling on the reserve at all. The word "picked" is no more applicable to them than to the troops of any nation sent to war at any time.

The answers to the hypochondriacs are, therefore,—

First,—That the number of men claimed do exist in actual flesh and blood, available for service. Second,—That as we have an army in Egypt and the Soudan equal to that which invaded the Crimea, another more than twice as strong in India, and large garrisons of fortresses, as well as a strong reserve of men in the prime of life, it

is not remarkable if the troops at home have an undue proportion of recruits. But the same appearance would be observed if the peace army of any continental nation were inspected. Third,—That the average quality of the Army is at least as good as it has ever been, and better than it has been in many stirring periods of English history; certainly better than the army which Arthur Wellesley first led in the Peninsula war. But, admitting all this, it by no means follows, as the official optimists have been telling us for years, that the Army is strong enough for the duties which it has to perform, duties which embrace the protection, external and internal, of the greatest empire on which the sun has ever shone. The actual territory ruled by England and Russia are about equal one to the other, but the population of the British Empire is about four times as numerous as that of Russia and all her tributary states. The carelessness, of which we have every reason to complain, amounts to this, that neither to-day nor at any other time is there, or has there been, any serious attempt to organize and apply to purposes of defence and national security the enormous resources which we possess. The responsibility for this neglect lies partly on official optimists of all political shades, partly on the curious apathy of the country with regard to military questions, and partly on the grumblers who resist all development and direct the mind of the public into wrong channels. It is satisfactory to observe that the country is awakening; the Government have shown some sense of the situation by deciding to increase the Army, and the grumblers have been silenced to some extent by the proof given in the Soudan of the splendid quality of the troops. The small increase of 3,000 men last month, proposed by Lord Hartington in the Supplementary Estimate, is really no increase at all. It is only the retention in the ranks of that number of men instead of sending them into the Reserve; but it may be hoped that the promised increase in the financial year, which begins to-day, means a real addition of 12,000 or 15,000 men to the fighting strength. The Army can be increased in two ways—by recruiting young soldiers and by retaining at their own desire men who would otherwise pass out of the Reserve at the end of their twelve years' service. Recruiting is unusually brisk, and all experience shows that it may be increased to a large extent by still further shortening the term of service with the colours. German soldiers serve only three years in the ranks. By accepting the same limitation we should have many more recruits, and the Reserve would grow much faster. Only, the men so enlisted would not be available for the ordinary peace service in India.

But the army of which we have hitherto spoken does not constitute by itself the entire forces of the Crown available for immediate service abroad. There exists behind it what used, by a misnomer, to be called the Reserves—that is, the Militia and

Volunteers. Reserves, as the word is understood in the military phraseology of modern times, means troops held in reserve during peace and doing their civil duties, but available to bring regiments up to war strength, and keep them so when required. Other forces, such as Landwehr in Germany, Territorial troops in France, Militia and Volunteers in England, are not properly called the reserve of the army. The Militia constitute a force strangely undervalued and misunderstood. That force is the only one to which conscription can be legally applied. It is therefore capable of almost unlimited expansion in case of emergency. At present it is supplied by voluntary enlistment, and holds only about 108,000 men, though it is now increasing in strength. It supplies the regular army with many recruits, who have already gone through an elementary course of drill. About a third of the army recruits last year came from the Militia, and were thus half-formed soldiers. It receives back into its ranks many old soldiers who have passed through both army and reserve service, and this class is increasing. It can be called out for service whenever the state of the Army may require it, and there is never a serious war in which Militia regiments do not anxiously try to be employed at the front or to garrison fortresses. It is an interesting fact that the one episode in the Franco-German war really creditable to the French was the defence of Belfort by troops who were practically Militia. For many years the Militia gradually declined; but it has again begun to grow. In spite of the large number of militiamen who joined the regular army in 1884, there was a net increase in the Militia of about 5,000 men. The number enlisted has grown rapidly. In round numbers the enlistments for the Militia have lately been as follows:—

In 1881	25,500
„ 1882	26,500
„ 1883	35,500
„ 1884	42,000

The rapid increase in 1883 was due to recommencing enlistments in Ireland. We have, then, in the Militia a constitutional force which is capable of large expansion. It has lately been bound more closely to line regiments, and this is, no doubt, one cause of its increasing popularity. Even deducting the Irish recruits, there were 10,000 more men enlisted in England and Scotland during 1884 than during 1882.

The Volunteers have gained so much deserved applause for their persistence in the face of some natural scepticism that they can afford to be treated with straightforward honesty. In the last ten years they have grown from 181,000 to 215,000 enrolled men, and they have won at last the privilege of carrying the same rifle as the line. It is, however, a great mistake to suppose that on the whole there is a good average of shooting among them. A few crack shots,

a larger number of less accomplished, but still fair, and the bulk of the force indifferent. That is the judgment of their own officers who know them best. And there is no legal right to call upon them for service, except in case of threatened invasion. Here is the weak point, and so long as it exists, they cannot expect the same consideration as other forces whose services are given with less restrictions. Volunteer battalions have offered their services on different occasions; but the force, as a whole, can only be counted upon in case of invasion. It supplies a few recruits to the line, but in this respect cannot be compared with the Militia, especially considering the relative size of the two forces.

The hypochondriacal party have asserted strenuously that the available forces of the country are rapidly decreasing. The assertion is absolutely devoid of fact, and we would ask those who really desire to know the truth, what is their opinion of the following figures, for figures must be given however dry they may appear. A combination of circumstances, the passing out of the Army of an immense number, both of long-service and short-service men at the same time, and the raising of the age of enlistment caused a falling off in 1882 and 1883; but that has been made up by the fitness of the year 1884. With the exception of those two years, the military forces of the Crown have been steadily increasing during the past ten years. We will, therefore, take the 1st January, 1876 and 1885, for purposes of comparison, except for Volunteers and Yeomanry, the returns for which came in a short time before that day of the month.

	1876.	1885.	Increase.	Decrease.
Regular Army, non-commissioned officers and men	175,856	181,008	5,152	—
First Class Army Reserve .	6,051	39,244	33,193	—
Militia, non-commissioned officers and men . . .	100,814	104,380	3,566	—
Yeomanry, non-commissioned officers and men .	11,633	10,801	—	832
Volunteers (enrolled) . .	181,080	215,015	33,935	—
Second Class Army Reserve	2,572	1,225	—	1,347
Total	<u>478,006</u>	<u>551,673</u>	<u>75,846</u>	<u>2,179</u>

Net Increase, 73,667.

It will be seen that the figures show an increase in every portion of the forces, except the Yeomanry and 2nd Class Army Reserve, and that the troops available for action all over the world in case of serious war, that is, the Regular Army and 1st Class Reserve, have increased by 38,345 men, or more than the strength of a full Army Corps, while the Militia Reserve, which is also available for all service, stands at the full strength allowed by law, namely, 30,000.

In the list given above, nothing is said of Asiatic or colonial forces, yet we know that there are many resources among these which could be counted upon. In a former crisis Canada offered 10,000 men to

serve against Russia, and it is now evident that other colonies might be relied upon for contingents. In every Indian crisis the great feudatory chiefs offer their armies, and it will be no exaggeration to say that the native Indian army could be increased by such means to fully 200,000 men. If, therefore, there were a war with Russia in the East we could depend upon having in India and on the frontier fully 300,000 men, if the Militia be used for garrison purposes. There are already about 200,000 Anglo-Indian troops, and the remainder would be easily made up by say, 70,000 men from home, including 1st Class Reserve, and by feudatory troops, with small contingents from colonies.¹

The other side of the picture shows that long and culpable negligence of organization has left us without the stores necessary for the army corps, which would be mobilized without a sufficient field artillery or engineer force. And the ports would be undefended both at home and abroad. Again, full use cannot be made of the Militia or Volunteers till the former are by law available for general service in case of need, and the latter become liable to be called out for home service, and as garrison for Ireland, even when there is no immediate prospect of invasion. There might be some readjustment of men required to meet such new regulations, but all indications point to the probability that the measures would, on the whole, be popular. The Militia would then be a force as available as the German Landwehr, and used like the latter, not so much for the first line in the campaign as for the work of the communications, which always absorbs so large a proportion of every British force. There have lately been about 16,000 English troops in Egypt and the Soudan, but Lord Wolseley has had at the front only from 6,000 to 7,000. Sir Gerald Graham has now above 12,000 at Suakin. In proportion as the railway advances so will the troops available for a fight at the front become less and less, till he will probably have less than half for an attack on Berber. If the Abyssinian campaign had dragged on a little longer, and the King drawn back a little further, there would have been no troops at all for a battle. All would have been used in guarding the communications. The application of the Militia to such purposes would strengthen the regular army in exact proportion to the number of Militia employed.

It has been shown that, counting merely armed men, there would be sufficient for the needs of the country, supposing that the addition now proposed by the Government for next year be voted, as it is sure to be. But the armed men must be made more available for our probable requirements. So long as we remained an insular power; so long as Russia was separated from us by wide regions of desert; so long as

(1) Compare the pessimistic groans over our weakness in India with the statement of the *Times* correspondent, 23rd March, that the natives are enthusiastically loyal, and that Lord Dufferin has already a field force of 50,000 men quite prepared to march for Herat.

the Continental nations were content without colonies, we could afford to be unready, because the danger was always distant. But all that is altered now. We are to touch the possessions of great military empires all over the world, and we must reconsider the whole scheme of imperial defence from top to bottom. There have been great exaggerations as to the condition of the fleet, but none the less is a large increase required, because our needs have changed. And the same must be said of our military strength. There is no use in blinking the fact that the interests and military possibilities of the world have been modified amazingly during the last few years, or even months. Formerly we held a position of complete independence. European wars were fought in Europe, and we were content to look on. Russia's aggressive designs touched Austria more nearly than England, and the only objectives of a Franco-German war were of necessity Berlin and Paris. To-day, and for ever hereafter, Russia touches our outposts in the East, where Austria has no interests, and a war between France and Germany would be fought over the habitable globe. The whole conditions of imperial power have changed, and we must meet them by new adjustments. It is time to cease wrangling on questions of long or short service, and the like. Not the addition or subtraction of a few thousand men more or less in the regular army are in question, but the complete reconstruction and renovation of the means of imperial defence. It has been shown that we have gained, not lost, in military strength of late years; but this is not the point. The question is, are we prepared to meet the new responsibilities which have come upon us unsought? and if not, what should we do?

The first answer must be, certainly, we are not prepared, and no further proof of it is needed than the consent of Mr. Gladstone's Government to increase the Navy, to add some 15,000 men to the Army, to fortify the coaling stations, and, at last, to prepare in good earnest the means which should always have existed for a mobilization of army corps. And if more evidence be needed, let the reader ask any War Office clerk of his acquaintance what amount of leisure is now to be found in that wonderful assembly. The German Minister of War touches a bell, and the army commences to mobilize itself, to be on a complete war footing in less than a week. But if a couple of English corps are to be moved, or even prepared for mobilization as at present, the excitement and confusion of the War Office is as prodigious as that of a disturbed ant-heap, and the whole manufacturing power of the country has to be called into play, though the equipment of these army corps has been laid down for ten years past, and, according to theory, should always be ready. Not a single Government has faced this question, and the natural result is seen in a hesitating attitude towards Russia, which may, like all hesitation, cause us to drift into war. At last the necessary preparations are

being made. Whether war comes or not, we trust that they will never again be suffered to fall into abeyance.

The needs of the empire are quite clear, though not so simple as those of Germany, for instance. They resolve themselves into two different requirements:—

- First.—A sufficient army, with strong reserves for home defence and possibilities of European warfare.
- Second.—A force in Asia, always ready for war. Necessary as this has always been considered, the necessity has been accentuated since Russia brought her forces up to the borders of Afghanistan.

Since the Indian Mutiny there has been a constant endeavour to work the two on one system, and to this attempt at compromise most of our failures are due. We are trying to put new wine in old bottles, and the result is unsatisfactory. A new departure must be taken, and the right direction seems sufficiently evident. The key to the problem is a frank recognition that the two armies for Europe and Asia must be worked on different lines. We must accept the principle of a localised Anglo-Asiatic army and a localised Home army, which would also garrison the Mediterranean fortresses and such of the colonies as are within reach. This principle is gradually making its way into favour, and Sir Lumley Graham has lately pointed out that every one of the sixteen essays written for the prize medal of the Royal United Service Institution accepts short service for the Home army as a necessity, but says that it is inapplicable to India. The essayists have, no doubt, ransacked every available source of information, and the unanimity of their opinion almost amounts to a demonstration. As a matter of course, the two armies would be available for general service in time of war just as they are now. There is good reason to believe that we might have a cheap and strong Home army closely approximate in principle with that of Germany, and the wailing of commanding officers, who have little to do but to train recruits and send them abroad, would no longer be heard. With such an army it might even be possible to adopt the manly principle, that it is the duty of every citizen to give personal service, if required, for the safety of the country, though it is fairly certain that the principle would not need to be applied any more than it now is for the Militia.

It may be said that this is a new departure, and we do not like new departures in England. Unfortunately there are some new departures which we like no better, but cannot help. It is a new departure to find ourselves a continental Power both in Asia and Africa, in exactly the same sense as France, Germany, and Austria are Continental Powers in Europe. And it is a very satisfactory new departure to see the colonies, for the protection of which we used to have to spend so much, now actually offering help in arms and money to the parent

country. The conditions are all new, and no measures will be worth talking about which do not honestly face the new problem.

To sum up, it must be recognised by all who will study the subject as a whole, without prejudice, instead of fixing their eyes on some part which happens to be close to them, until they become mesmerized and the slaves of one idea :—

First.—That the present military strength of the country is much greater than it was ten years ago, and quite double that which existed in the time of the Crimean war.

Second.—That there has been gross national carelessness in allowing all the preparations for mobilizing an army to stand over till time of actual danger; and not keeping up the reserves of stores as they ought to have been kept up.

Third.—That, supposing time given us to provide the material now deficient, we could in addition to the force in Egypt and the Soudan, at once put with ease two army corps into the field as re-inforcements to India, or to act wherever may be necessary.

Fourth.—Though this is sufficient for the moment, it is not nearly enough to meet the new condition of continental responsibilities all over the world. The process of drawing in our horns everywhere when challenged must come to an end at last. Other nations will cease to press us when we have accepted our responsibilities and provided for them, but not before then.

Fifth.—That definite principles must be laid down for a new departure, and those principles should be: A distinct organization for the Home and the Asiatic armies, the former to be based upon shorter service than now, and larger reserves, with honest decentralization and complete readiness for war, just as the German army is always ready; the latter to be based upon moderately long service with pensions, and the readiness of all units for the field.

Lastly.—Let us get out of our heads all nonsense about fortifications being a challenge to foreign Powers. They are challenging us rather freely just now. The most pressing need of all is the fortification of commercial ports and coaling stations, with the necessary supply of guns for the new works. Till these are ready the fleet is half paralysed.

Writers are running to their *Shakespeares* just now. It might be well for them to remember that for England to be true to herself does not mean sitting down and fatuously trusting that all will go well. It means facing the existing situation like men, forcing governments to act, and submitting cheerfully to such sacrifices as may be necessary to preserve both territory and that honour which is not a mere sentiment but the foundation of the grand commercial fabric called English trade.

A FIELD OFFICER.

ALBANIA AND THE ALBANIANS.

At a time when Albania is in a state of insurrection, the ideas and impressions which I received of the country whilst recently travelling in it may not be altogether wanting in interest or value. It is a curious and attractive journey—comparatively little known, although within easy reach of England—from Trieste to Cattaro, and thence, through Montenegro, to Senturi of Albania. The start from Trieste in the early morning, with the blue sea stretching far away to the west; the hills of beautifully varying foliage, through which white houses here and there peep out; the etil-fated Chateau Miramar, standing forth in bold relief; the snow-capped peaks of the far-off mountains of the Tyrol; the glaring white, and rigidly perpendicular, buildings of the town; the continual movement of ships, steamers, fishing-craft—all the bustle incidental to a large port; and over everything the indescribable light of the morning sun,—produce a first impression which harmonises well with the subsequent voyage down the east coast of the unstable Adriatic.

Everything one encounters is worth seeing—from the marvellous remains of Roman civilisation and architecture, and the more recent ruins of Venetian greatness, scattered along the coast, to the handsome, romantic-looking Dalmatians, and the ill-paved, narrow, dirty, but always picturesque streets of the modern towns. Most striking is the arrival at Cattaro. The effect of the huge rocky mountains of Montenegro, towering above, and seeming ready to topple over upon the little white towns nestling along the shores of the all but land-locked lakes of the famous “Bocche,” is strange and weird. This impression is in no wise diminished as, mounted on a little rough pony, he scrambles up the old precipitous, zig-zag “Escaladra” (there is a new carriage-road, but the inhabitants much prefer the old pack-horse path), stumbling over boulders and rough-hewn rock, and passes through the clouds into the celebrated country of the “Black Mountain.” At his first halting-place, Njegûsh, he is introduced to a people whose like he has surely never seen before; so quaint a mixture of civilisation and primitive simplicity do they present. He will, perhaps, be addressed in neat French by a man in much the costume of an ordinary English tramp—a great traveller; he will be surrounded by a crowd, most of those composing which are clad in the picturesque dress now so familiar from pictures of pen and pencil drawing and description; he will be shown a schoolroom (to reach it he must climb up a ladder out of a cow-house), in which is a clock-work orrery, while a large blackboard and rows of much hacked desks and forms strongly recall an

ordinary English village school; the next moment the school-master, a good-looking, well-mannered young man, will point out, with evident pride, a hoary old warrior as "un de nos gros capitaines" (*sic*), who has cut off the heads of no less than thirty Turks. And so, with much food for reflection, he will advance, always through the lunar-like landscape of bare rocky hills, to Cettinje—that desolate, lonely little capital perched like an eagle's nest amidst bleak mountain tops, and with a population of about four hundred souls, in the midst of which flourishes a princely court, with all the ceremonies, the manners, the precedences, the routine of a St. James's Palace or a Tuileries. Owing to its geographical position and physical features, Montenegro cannot perhaps have much future. But there can be no doubt that the whole community, from the highest to the lowest, intend to make the most of what nature has given them.

From Cettinje to Bjeka, at the northern extremity of the Lake of Scutari, the journey lies through a sterile country, which grows more smiling and less sterile as the lake is neared; and after a six hours' steam in a small pinnace belonging to the Prince, the lake scenery *en route* being most lovely, Scutari of Albania is at last reached. This, with the exception of Janina, is the most important town in the whole of Albania, and certainly one of the most picturesque. Its red roofs peeping up from amongst masses of green foliage; its old tumble-down bazaar, roofed in years ago with rough planking, half of which has rotted or fallen away, while vines clinging round what is left afford an ever-varying shade against the fierce rays of the sun; its quaint old Venetian fortress, ruined by time and explosions, frowning above the town; its stunted mosques and graceful minarets; the lovely expanse of lake, bounded on north, east, and west by magnificent ranges of rocky mountains—all contribute to form a most striking and beautiful whole. The inhabitants are well in keeping with their surroundings. Here you may see the swinging *fustanella* and portentous rolling swagger of the Mussulman townsman; there the red jacket and baggy black drawers of his Christian fellow; here again the tight-fitting white leggings and the black jacket (still worn as a sign of mourning for Iskander Bey) of the Miridite, or the brilliant vest of the *Bayraktar*; on this side glows the yellow-embroidered scarlet cloak of the Roman Catholic lady; on that the gold-embroidered chocolate mantle and white yashmak of the Mussulman dame; an endless variety of colour and costume are continually shifting and passing before your eyes, while silver-mounted arms flashing in the sun lend everywhere an additional sparkle and glitter to the scene. The men, here and everywhere in North Albania, are tall, lithe, and active, with an exceedingly intelligent expression of face, sharp-cut aquiline features, broad forehead, and a peculiar flash of the eyes and intensity of look.

The women, on the other hand, are generally coarse in feature and stunted in figure, but the quite young girls are usually graceful and handsome; it is more than probable that their subsequent want of beauty is the result of the severe out-of-door labour which they continually undergo, for they are treated as mere beasts of burden. The intelligence of the men is not belied by their looks. They are pre-eminent in building, gardening, silver-work, lace-work, architecture, and in fact in all branches of industry requiring either skilled labour or artistic taste; while it is no uncommon occurrence to find an Albanian occupying a high position in the Government of the Ottoman Empire. They are, moreover, as a rule honest, hospitable, and thoroughly true to the rules of their own code of honour, while their valour is almost proverbial.

Nevertheless, their country shows few signs of progress. Their implements of husbandry, for instance, are well-nigh biblical in their simplicity and rudeness; they have no modern appliances, and are content to work as their ancestors worked centuries before them; their habits and customs are such as must have been handed down unchanged from father to son for countless ages. The race slightly deteriorates in physique towards the south, but in other respects the above remarks apply perfectly well to all parts of Albania. Everywhere can be found men of superior intelligence, nowhere any evidence of enlightenment or civilisation. The fact that a race possessed of such marked natural advantages remains stationary, or even "progresses backward," whilst round it young states are growing up and flourishing—states, indeed, whose populations are remarkable neither for bodily nor mental superiority—cannot but strike the traveller as a curious anomaly. A little careful observation, however, will explain the phenomenon. For centuries past Albania has been suffering from internal dissensions. The country as generally understood may be divided into three parts, viz., Guegania, or North Albania; Toskania, or Central Albania; and Epirus, or South Albania. The latter, with the exception of a small strip of territory on the coast, extending from Cape Glossa as far south as Patra, and inhabited by an offshoot of the Tosks called the Tchams, can only be said to be Albanian in the most arbitrary sense. The Tchams are a quiet, inoffensive, agricultural people, becoming fast Hellenicised by their close intercourse with the Epirotes, whose fortunes they would probably prefer to follow. Their sympathies are so little with the Albanians, that when the latter came trampling down from the north to demonstrate against the Greeks, they threatened, as harvest-time was near, to oppose them by force of arms should they encroach in any way upon their territory. As for the Epirotes themselves, they may be considered pure Greeks. Their language is Greek, their names are Greek, they are

thoroughly Greek in thought and feeling, habits and religion. It would be incorrect to say that there are no Mussulmans, but they are the exception and not the rule. Many of them, moreover, are relics of the history of Ali Pasha Tepelen. The first step on the road to favour in his eyes was to be converted to the faith of Islam, and not a few of the present Mussulman Epirotes are descendants of the apostates of his time, who set temporal advantages before religious belief. This fact accounts for some most curious customs amongst many of the Mussulmans of Epirus. They are careful to observe the festivals of the Greek Church, they pray to Greek saints, they acknowledge the authority of the Greek bishops, and when sick they ask Greek priests to pray over them—perhaps one of the most remarkable instances on record of an endeavour to serve both God and Mammon.

Some parts of Southern Epirus have only comparatively recently been included in Albania, or indeed in the Ottoman Empire at all. This is shown by a very interesting convention concluded between ~~Ruman~~ ^{Rumania} and the Sublime Porte on the 21st March (old style), 1800, at Constantinople, and confirmed in October of that year in the same capital by the other Powers of Europe. Both this convention, and the subsequent history of the territory to which the articles about to be quoted refer, seem to have been unaccountably lost sight of in the late rearrangement of the Greek frontier. Article VIII. sets forth that "the districts of *Prevesa, Parga, Vonitza, and Butrinto*, which are separated from the Venetian rule on account of their proximity to Albania" (not, let it be remarked, because they are Albanian) "with all their dependencies, shall be united to the Ottoman Empire, and shall be included in the possessions of the Sublime Porte, from the present and for the future." It goes on to say that "the inhabitants *being without exception Christian*," they shall enjoy special privileges as regards religious and other customs; and that, as in the Danubian principalities, "it shall be forbidden to any Mahometan to acquire possessions in, or inhabit," the said province; but that nevertheless they must submit to an Ottoman governor-general, who would receive stringent instructions to treat them with the greatest possible indulgence and the most perfect justice. Article X. promises that the rayas of the said districts, "which now come under the domination of the Porte for the first time," shall only pay a most moderate tax, at no time more than that paid previously to the Venetian Republic; and that, in consideration of the sufferings they had endured in the late wars, they should pay no taxes whatever for, two years, to commence from the date of the signature of the treaty. The Porte remained true to its word for a considerable period. A certain Abdullah Bey, who seems to have been a merciful and enlightened governor, ruled

the province—sealed in the treaty continent—formed of the above-mentioned districts for six years, to the complete satisfaction of the rayas. That time is still referred to in Southern Epirus as the “Golden Age.” In the year 1806, however, Abdullah Bey was dismissed, and the province came under the authority of Ali Pasha Tebelen of Janina. It is hardly necessary to say that misrule and oppression soon began. In a short while Ali Pasha had confiscated most of the property worth having, and had transferred it to some of “my Albanians.” The unhappy rayas protested; Ali Pasha took no notice of their protests. They applied for redress to the Porte, and, failing to obtain it, emigrated almost *en masse* to Zante. On this Ali Pasha received so sharp and threatening a reprimand from the Porte, that he addressed a letter to the emigrants, beseeching them to return, and acknowledging his former injustice, which he promised should be immediately discontinued. They acceded to his request, and for a short time remained in possession of their own property. But Ali Pasha soon broke his word, and again enriched his Albanians at the expense of the people whose special privileges he had been ordered to protect. After this no further remedy was obtained. Several of the governors-general who followed Ali Pasha, and more especially a certain Mehemet Ali in the year 1848, acknowledged in writing the validity of the grievances under which the rayas professed to be suffering, and promised to apply for redress to the Porte. They may perhaps have applied, but no redress came. As late as the year 1850 a petition was sent from Prevesa to the Vuli of Janina, imploring for the long-expected restitution of rights. This was as futile as those which preceded it, and was the last attempt made to secure justice. From that time to this the land has remained in the unquestioned possession of the usurpers. Nevertheless, Ali Pasha’s attempt thus violently to albanicise Southern Epirus has had no practical success. Even now in the province mentioned in the treaty only eighty-four Albanian families are to be found.

It is impossible to leave this subject without a passing reference to the brilliant, wayward, erratic genius whose poetry, adventures, and sadly early death have thrown an unfading glamour of romance over the names of Epirus, Ali Pasha, and Albania itself. The beautiful stanzas of the second canto of *Childe Harold*, read amidst the scenes they describe, assume an interest so vivid, and are so poetically true to nature, that it is hard to believe that the poet is not there in person, and that one’s travelling companion is but the poem written by a hand long since dead and cold. The lovely hills and dales round Janina, rock, river, forest, mountain, still as of yore, lavish their magic charms on “the little shepherd in his white capote,” and call as bewitchingly as ever to the loitering pilgrim to

stop, and "gaze untired the morn, the noon, the eve away." And Ali Pasha—that "man of war and woes," with all his palaces, his pomp, his slaves, eunuchs, soldiers, guests, and santonis—what of him? There is an old man at Janina who remembers the cruel despot well, and will tell you in detail the story of his treacherously planned death. There are naturally, innumerable stories rife at Janina of the disgraceful deeds committed at the instigation of Ali Pasha. One or two are here selected, not because they are supposed to be in any degree accurate, but because it may be interesting to hear the versions which live amongst the people, and to understand the hatred and fear with which the name is still remembered. It is commonly said, for instance, that under his palace Ali Pasha built a stone vault in which to conceal a fabulous amount of treasure. In order that no living person might know the whereabouts of this hiding-place, he had all the masons who had taken part in it killed. It is told also with harrowing details how, at the instance of a jealous daughter-in-law, he drowned twenty of the prettiest girls of Janina in the lake.¹ A more and more sensational version of this story considerably augments the number of the victims, and declares that Ali Pasha had the cushions of his divan stuffed with their hair. Still more horrible is the tale related of the capture of a body of French troops at Prevesa.² It is said that Ali Pasha, seated on a balcony, had the unfortunate Frenchmen brought before him one by one and beheaded, their heads and bodies being thrown into one ghastly heap. The executioner did his work well at first; but presently, overcome by the sickening sight, his legs gave way under him, and he fell dead to the ground. Some say that a fresh executioner was called, others that Ali continued the fearful work with his own hand. But most agree in the sequel. A certain number of men, they say, were spared for the hideous purpose of being forced to search in the heap of dead for the heads of their comrades, and to carry them to Janina, there to decorate the walls of Ali Pasha's palace. The tale of the fate of the beautiful Zofreni is also told, almost word for word, as given by Hobhouse.

From such stories as these it is more pleasant to turn to Lord Byron's personal impressions, as shown in his letters, and notes to *Childe Harold*, and with them to compare, as it were, the jottings of one's own note-book. It is a little puzzling at first to know in what light he looked upon the Epirotes. At one place he refers to Delvinaki as the "frontier village between Epirus and Albania Proper," at another he calls the Epirotes indiscriminately Albanians. This,

(1) Cf. *Don Juan*, canto v. note to stanza 92.

(2) This story, stripped of its most hideous details, is told by Hobhouse in his *Voyage through Albania*. But the victims, in his account, were two hundred Prevesiotas who had helped the French.

as well as the curious error of classing Montenegrins amongst Albanians, is, perhaps, partly to be explained by his not having travelled far enough north to be able to judge of the striking difference between the true Albanian and the Epirote, but chiefly by the fact that when he visited Epirus in 1809 the districts whose history has been given above had already been two years in the possession of the Albanians of Ali Pasha, and Epirus had long since wholly submitted to the latter's authority. Hobhouse says that almost all Albanians speak Greek, and those who are educated read it. This applies perfectly well to the population of that part of Albania which he and Lord Byron visited; but it would not be too much to affirm that north of Berat there is hardly a single Greek-speaking Albanian to be found, although there are many true Albanians of the Greek religion. In other respects the impressions of the modern traveller will be found to agree exactly with those received and recorded by Lord Byron and his fellow-traveller. The writer saw acted before his eyes, almost to the letter, the spirited description of the night-scene at Utraikey,¹ the real circumstances of which are given in animated details by Hobhouse in his description of the song *κλεφτεῖς ποτε παρῶν*. The song in this case was not the same, but was in Tosk Albanian. The scene, however, was reproduced exactly. The Albanians sat round a blazing wood fire, and half-droned, half-screamed a wild song, swaying their bodies to and fro in tune, and every now and then getting up and whirling round the fire, an amusement which was kept up far into the night.

Intimately connected though as is Lord Byron's name with Epirus (it is, and naturally so, well known among the educated Epirotes), the name of another Englishman has a still greater power with the people, and is looked up to by them as a true symbol of hope. By a curious error, the party with whom I was travelling in Epirus were supposed to be friends of the Commissioners come for settling the new boundary of Greece. We were met along the road from Seyada to Janina by deputations from villages far and near, to pray that at least *they* might be included in Greece. From every one the salutation at meeting and parting was the same, until the whole country seemed to be ringing from end to end with the words, "Viva Gladstone." Mr. Gladstone was looked upon as the saviour of their country, the man in whom they trusted for coming prosperity and happiness, for reunion with their real fatherland. This was, of course, declared by the Turkish notables at Janina to be an organised demonstration, a result of Greek intrigue and Greek bribery. At Philiates, the owner of the house in which we stayed was immensely proud because that was the house in which "ὁ κύριος Γλαδστον" had stopped twenty-two years before when he made an excursion from Corfu into Epirus. "He

(1) *Childe Harold*, canto ii. stanzas 70 to 73.

was a very clever man," said he; "I am glad he is still alive." "Why so?" we asked. "Because he will put us all to rights," was the prompt answer. The account of an inhabitant of Velchista was truly pathetic. On being asked whether he was contented under the existing *régime*, "No," he replied, "we are anything but contented. Our only remedy is to be joined to our mother—Greece. We have nothing in common with Albania. Taxes may be heavy in Greece, but at least we should have commerce and improvement. We dare not build factories—do anything—for under the Turks we have no security. My name is Greek; all names here are Greek, because in ancient times Greece and Epirus were all one, as they should be now. But it cannot last for ever—our hope is in Gladstone." Another man was equally eloquent in his pleading, averring the impossibility of the country remaining much longer under the yoke of the Turks, and ending, "but we will send petitions to Gladstone; he is a great and good man, and will give the Greeks what is theirs." If these are not considered sufficient proofs of the popular yearning to be united to Greece, we might go back into not remote history, and remember that the Suliotes, a chiefly Greek-speaking Tscham tribe of Epirus, were not only continually at war with Ali Pasha and the Albanians, but were amongst the first to commence the Greek War of Independence; and that Botzari, one of their number, was perhaps the greatest of the many heroes who fell in the early part of that terrible struggle. Epirus has, in fact, from time immemorial been Greener did in points, but name; it is to be hoped that that, one of a sight in points, but name; it is to be hoped that soon.

With Guoguanu and Foskanu the case is different. It is not within the scope of this article to enter on a disquisition as to the origin of the Albanian race, a subject on which various great authorities have differed. Hobhouse says that of the ancient Illyrian race not one remains in Albania, and having mentioned Scythian Slavi and Asiatic Albanians, comes later on to the remarkable conclusion that the modern Albanians are a mixture of Greek, Roman, Goth, Vandal, Spaniard, Italian, Bulgarian, and Ottoman. Pouqueville says they are descended from Gauls. Herr Kiepert puts them down as Illyrians. Meletius affirms that they are neither descended from Illyrians nor Asiatic Albanians, but from Celts, who came to Japygia, in Italy, and thence passed over to Dyrrhachium, and dispersed about the neighbouring country. A modern Albanian, Abdul Bey Frassari, who aspires to much learning, assured me it was incontestable that the Albanians are the true representatives of the Pelasgi; that there is therefore a certain connection between Albanians and Greeks, but that the latter are a debased branch, whereas the former are pure-blooded descendants of the real stock. He also declared the Albanian

language to be identical with the ancient Pelasgic. This opinion was, however, probably surcharged with patriotism. In a most admirable pamphlet on *The Languages of the Seat of War*, published in 1854, Professor Max Müller, the greatest authority living, refused to pronounce "any decided opinion on the origin and growth of this isolated dialect" of Albania, which would probably give the true origin of the people. Dr. Hahn, in his extraordinarily complete and able work, *Albanesische Studien*, leans decidedly to the opinion that they are descended from Illyrians, that is to say, in the wide acceptation of the term, Pelasgi. He considers the principal proof of this Pelasgic origin to be the relation between the Albanian language and the most ancient Greek mythology, and he concludes also that the Albanians are autochthonous, in the sense that the memory of their first entry into the land is lost. Be that as it may, the Albanian race has so distinct a type as to compel one to the conclusion that both Guegs and Tosks come of one pure stock, which has been affected but slightly by contact with other races; the difference between the two being, perhaps, that an element chiefly Slav has crept by degrees into the Gueg blood, and one chiefly Wallacho-Greek into the Tok. They speak dialects of the same isolated language. But in spite of their close blood relationship, they are bitterly hostile towards one another. The Guegs look down upon and despise the Tosks, who in their turn view the Guegs with extreme jealousy and dislike. It is acknowledged unreservedly by both that they cannot live in peace together. A practical illustration of this was afforded not long ago by a large proprietor in Epirus, who stated that he had several times endeavoured to make Guegs and Tosks work together upon his estates. He had finally to desist from the attempt. They were continually quarrelling, and more than once blood was spilt between them.

Besides these main divisions, both North and Central Albania are split up into various tribes, each jealous of its own rights, and refusing to mix with any other, or to recognise any leader beyond its own *bayraktar*, or standard-bearer. In the interior it is by no means uncommon to hear of a skirmish that has just taken place between neighbouring tribes, or to have scenes of former struggles pointed out by an informer who will tell you tales of civil war as if they were the most natural thing in the world. Even here excuses for bloodshed do not stop. Each tribe fosters within itself a multiplicity of fatal dissensions and deadly quarrels, a bare recital of which is sufficient to make the blood run cold, the principal social rule which obtains in Albania being the *vendetta*. The following incident, which sounds as incredible as the story of the white hen in *The Corsican Brothers*, will be sufficient to show the frightful extent to which this murderous custom flourishes there. It was related to the writer by

a monk who had passed most of his life amongst the Albanians. He knew, he said, of a *vendetta* which had its origin in a certain man trespassing on to the field of a neighbour. Three hundred men had been killed and wounded over the quarrel which ensued on these slight grounds, and it had already lasted for two generations. Two whole villages are now involved in it, skirmishes are continually occurring, and there is no hope that the difference will be settled without many more murders being committed.

The state of religion in Albania complicates matters still further. The religions are three in number, viz., Mussulman, Roman Catholic, and Orthodox or Greek. It is extremely difficult to obtain any reliable statistics¹ as to the true proportions in which the numbers of the believers in these creeds stand to one another. But it can be stated as almost certain that in Guegania the Roman Catholics are in excess of the Mussulmans, the Orthodox being in a very small minority; while in Toskania the Mussulmans preponderate, and comparatively few Roman Catholics are to be found. - As a rule the Mussulmans muster more strongly in the towns, and the Roman Catholics (especially in North Albania) in the mountains and plains. On the whole, were the two Christian sects to combine, they would probably slightly outnumber the Mussulmans. Great ill-feeling exists between the different sects, almost as much between the Greek and Roman Catholic as between the Christian and Mahometan. A characteristic instance of the never-ending hatred between the two latter occurred about four years ago in a small village in North Albania. Some young Mussulmans there, apparently out of pure mischief, used the cross of a Roman Catholic chapel as a rifle mark, and shot it away. By way of retaliation, the Christians dressed a pig in the guise of a Chodja, and tied it up in the pulpit of the mosque. Furious at this insulting desecration, the Mahometans, on discovering it, rushed from the mosque, found the Christians waiting to see the effects of their revenge, fell upon them, and a skirmish ensued in which several lives were lost. Such examples might be multiplied to an almost indefinite extent; hardly a week passes without scuffles taking place which often end in bloodshed and loss of life.

With all these fruitful and complicated elements of discord, enmity, and estrangement between Guegs* and Tosks, jealousies between the different tribes, *vendetta* quarrels between neighbouring families, hatred and strife between Mussulman, Roman Catholic, and Greek, it is clear that an exceptionally wise and firm government would be required to enable the people to make any progress what-

(1) Nor are there any to hand of the actual population of Albania. According to the most reliable accounts it may be put down at anything between 1,700,000 and 2,000,000. It is worth remarking that Hahn estimates it in 1862 at 1,500,000; and Leake in 1806 considers Albania as the most populous province of European Turkey.

ever. And here the key-note of Albanian misfortune is struck. The word "government," as applied to the sway which the Turks hold over Albania, is a mere misapplication of terms. The country is divided certainly into vilayets (viz. those of Scutari, Kossovo, Monastir, and Janina), as are the other provinces of the Ottoman empire, but apparently only for the purposes of taxation and recruiting soldiers. All existing resources are drained away from the province, and no compensating return is made to it. The Albanian soldiers are the very flower of the Turkish army. Not many after enlistment ever come back to their native country. Those that do so return poorer than they went, rapidly forget such discipline as they have undergone, and sink back into a state which is worse than their first. There is not a single public work to testify to the proper application of the taxes which are enforced. And these are not a few. There are taxes upon houses, upon sheep, upon almost every sort of property. With these exceptions, the sovereign power takes little interest in its Arnaut subjects, who from the time of Iskander Bey to the present day have been treated in a *laissez-aller* fashion, which could not but have been disastrous to a people of a far quieter disposition. It is possible that the Turks may have shrunk from the difficulties of completely subduing so hardy and courageous a race of mountaineers. But, whatever the cause, they have in fact been permitted to enjoy a kind of quasi-independence, the internal affairs of each tribe being still regulated by its own "council of elders" (*Pijetshenia*), assisted by a "general assembly," whose members (*Gjobar*) are representatives of small divisions of from four to six houses, and still further supported when matters of great importance have to be discussed by a tribal gathering, in which at least one man out of every family is forced to take part—an arrangement not altogether dissimilar in kind to the "communes" of Russia, which, being possessed of a complete local self-government, have as regards the state no political power whatever. This system, instead of crushing out traditional enmities and quarrels, and keeping them down with a strong hand, has naturally tended to encourage and increase them. And it is more than probable that the Porte has not only viewed this result with no disfavour, but has deliberately shaped its policy to promote it; for whereas there is no difficulty in retaining a hold over an Albania rendered powerless by the number of intricate internal disorders which are for ever wasting away her strength, it would require a most serious effort to suppress any really national movement were all petty discords and heartburnings to be cast aside, and a strong coalition formed for the common good.

This supposition is strongly supported by the treatment to which the country has been subjected as regards its material welfare.

There are no carriage or even cart-roads; the pack-horse roads, of which there are very few, were constructed by the Venetians, and since their time have been so utterly neglected that they are no longer worthy of the name; such bridges as there may be are again relics of Venetian industry, and, although in a ruinous condition, are merely patched up where necessity drives, but never properly repaired; rivers are allowed to overflow their banks and devastate vast tracts of rich land; no encouragement is afforded to trade or any peaceful pursuit; if public works are commenced they are left not half completed; in fine, the province is allowed to flounder along in a state of hopeless distress. Thus left without any proper means of communication or possibilities of improving their trade, the people remain, as in the past, split up into innumerable divisions, and with nothing better at hand to pass their time than to wreak vengeance on one another for imaginary insults and to brood over traditional wrongs.

The excellence of this policy, from the Turkish point of view, has been apparent during the last few years. The Porte has been able to use Albania as a convenient diplomatic fulcrum for the *non possumus* lever with which they oppose any suggestion made by Europe for the general peace of that turbulent part of the world. In spite of all their disadvantages the Albanians are too intelligent a people not to have commenced to chafe and fret at the curb which is holding them back from civilisation and progress. Intrigues are continually being set on foot, feelers are thrown out towards an understanding with Austria, autonomy and independence are here and there openly spoken of, and criticisms are made on the present sovereign government which certainly do not befit the lips of loyal subjects. On these signs the Turks, secure in the position they had made, were wont to look with their usual quiet disdain, until the doings of the famous Albanian League startled them from their composure. It will be remembered that this institution sprang into existence immediately after the signature of the Treaty of San Stefano, for the avowed purpose of preserving the integrity of Albanian territory. The Treaty of Berlin supplanted that of San Stefano, but was little more pleasing to Albanian ideas. Accordingly the League refused, first, to submit to the award of the Berlin Treaty, and, secondly, to the arrangement of the Montenegrin frontier known as the Corti Compromise. In both these determinations it was distinctly supported and upheld by the Turks. A fresh proposition, to which Montenegrin assent had previously been secured, was then made in the form of a collective note from the ambassadors at Constantinople to the Porte. This was as strenuously resisted by the League as the two first, nor could the Turkish Government be brought to enforce the European decisions upon its

recalcitrant subjects. On the contrary, it continued substantially to encourage them. Large bands of so-called insurgents were permitted to assemble at Tusi and Dulcigno, within a few miles of Scutari—nay, to march with warlike demonstrations through the very town of Scutari itself—whilst all the time a strong Turkish force was at hand, amply sufficient to disperse the different rebel contingents piecemeal as they marched on their way to the trysting-place. The celebrated Dulcigno Naval Demonstration followed. At first it had no results, beyond giving rise to a series of amusing if somewhat undignified events. The tardy and unwilling arrival of the French squadron; the perfect Eastern placidity and *insouciance* with which the Turk regarded the formidable and threatening force floating just outside his waters; the three days' *ultimatum* sent to Riza Pasha, who received it with sarcastic courtesy, and took no further notice of it whatever; the apparent defiance of the will of Europe by a few thousand mountaineers; and the curious attitude assumed (it was doubtless forced upon them), after no little blustering, by the most heroic race in Europe—were parts which certainly did not go to make up an imposing whole. But presently came a threat to seize Smyrna—a threat evidently not intended to be an empty one. Hard pressed, the Turks now commenced to endeavour to undo the work they had begun. This, however, was no easy matter. Albanian patriotism and ire had been excited to a very high pitch, and the League was determined to cede nothing. The rebels were by this time assembled in force, and had there been unanimity in their counsels—could they have permitted ancient quarrels for once to subside—instead of the farce-like skirmish near Dulcigno which ensued, there might have been a tragedy on a large scale and a terrible insurrection. But the Turks knew perfectly well with whom they had to deal. It was curious how, every day, fresh divisions occurred in the Albanian camp. One tribe would not leave Tusi; another would not go farther than Scutari; a third went home altogether; a fourth swore allegiance to the Turks—and so on, until at last but a very few hundred men were left to oppose the troops brought against them. Albanian patriotism had been drowned by a little skilful Turkish management in tribal jealousies.

The Naval Demonstration thus gained its own particular end, inasmuch as the town and district of Dulcigno were subsequently handed over peaceably by the Turks to the Montenegrins. On the other hand the Turks, for their part, obtained two results. First, they were able to keep alive tribal jealousies, and at a critical moment to turn them to good account; and, secondly, they succeeded, at the risk of sowing fresh seeds of revolt against their own authority, in convincing the Albanians that they were a people ill-considered and unjustly treated by Europe, and therefore entitled to resist, with all

possible means that lay in their power; any future proposals that might be made for the settlement of their northern frontier by the cession of portions of territory to Montenegro, however insignificant these might be, and however little Albanian the sympathies of their inhabitants. The risk here referred to, intensified as it is by the undiminished discontent of the people at their backward condition, has not been long in making itself known. Since the time of the Naval Demonstration, there has been more than one rising. On every occasion the same tactics have been pursued, with the same results, and that which at one time threatens to become a formidable national movement invariably vanishes into thin air before the clever intrigue of the Turks. It follows as a natural consequence to this treatment that the Albanians have come to be commonly and quite erroneously looked upon as no better than an extensive band of robbers, having no aspirations beyond plunder, and no ideas other than to fight and to maraud. Therefore to a superficial observer, or to one who has not had the opportunity of studying the country well, there appears to be no reason why the sympathies of Europe should be enlisted in their cause. And this judgment is widely pronounced upon a people who would repay any efforts made on their behalf, at least as well as the more fortunate races in whose interest the Great Powers have of late years exerted themselves so strongly.

What the future of Albania may be it is difficult to foresee. Epirus might well be included in the kingdom of Greece. But for Albania proper the question cannot be so easily settled. To grant her autonomy or independence in her present state is out of the question. The first would merely give rise to endless civil war. The same reason, and the additional one that she is not powerful enough to resist unaided the encroachments of the stronger states which surround her, should prevent her obtaining the second. Is it useless to hope that the Turks themselves will ere long come to understand that, although their rule may not be cruelly oppressive, yet the corruption and utter carelessness which pervade all parts of their government, both central and provincial, will as surely lead to their being stripped of their fairest provinces as the most disastrous defeat in war? Will they never realise the fact that the only certain foundation of the stability and greatness of an empire lies in the content and prosperity of its subjects, and not in the military superiority of the dominant race? These are questions which they alone can answer; and, if they shut their eyes so that they should not see the precipice to which the road they now choose to follow is leading them, they have only themselves to blame. It would suit Austrian policy, as generally construed, eminently well to include the country in an armed occupation similar to that in which she at present holds Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is an almost universally accepted proposition

that she is anxious to extend her possessions as far as Salonica, not only to secure the valuable commerce which would thus be laid open to her, but to obtain also some certain compensation for any possible future disaster which may befall her as regards some of her Slav, or even of her German, dominions. It is essential to this design that she should possess at any rate a portion of Northern Albania. Otherwise her line of communications would be exposed to Albanian raids on the west flank for a length of about one hundred and twenty miles. She could therefore never look with composure upon the formation there of a new and possibly hostile state, nor upon the embodiment of Albania with some other power, which might become unfriendly and cause her great annoyance. Either of these courses, however satisfactory they might appear at first, would certainly lead to further complications. Moreover, the idea of an Austrian protectorate is not unknown amongst the Northern Albanians, and by some of them at least is received with no dislike. While they despise the Greeks and regard the Slavs with bitter hatred, many of them are ready to acknowledge that they are not strong enough to stand alone, and turn to Austria as a natural and powerful friend. One of the chiefs of the Clementi tribe once said as much to the writer, in almost so many words. "The Greeks!" said he, "they could do nothing for us! Why, go and travel in Greece; you will find they are as badly off as we are! No Albanian could ever endure to be subject to a Slav state. But Austria,—— Ah! that is quite a different matter!"

Whether this be the solution accepted, or whether another will be sought and found, by the future combined wisdom of European statesmen, or whether some really wise Turkish rulers will arise, to render such a solution unnecessary, one thing is certain. So long as the present neglect and misrule are allowed to flourish in Albania, so long will a highly intelligent people capable of great progress and development remain plunged in the hopeless depths of a civil turmoil and miserable ignorance whose parallels are only to be found in the dark annals of the Middle Ages, a source of untold distress to themselves, and a nucleus of disturbance which, unless removed, may at any time seriously endanger the peace of Europe. It is most earnestly to be hoped that this fact may be promptly recognised with the force it deserves, and that on it steps may be taken which will enable the unhappy Albanians soon to take their proper place amongst the civilised communities of the world.

V. H. P. CAILLARD.

A MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

ON the 29th of June, 1883, a debate took place in the House of Commons, upon the motion of Sir John Lubbock, with regard to a Ministry of Education. During that debate the opinions of most of the leading statesmen within the last quarter of a century were quoted in favour of the proposal, and such arguments as were brought forward against it were based only upon some doubt, hesitation, or fear that it might not accomplish all that was hoped. As the result of the debate, a motion was adopted for the appointment of a Select Committee "to consider how the Ministerial responsibility, under which the votes for education, science, and art are administered, may best be secured." The Select Committee consisted of seventeen members, and its chairman was the Chancellor of the Exchequer. On the 31st of July, 1884, it reported unanimously that there should be a Minister of Education, having charge of English and Scotch education, in separate departments; that the Minister should have authority not only to call for reports and information, but also to direct inquiries or inspection to be made in the case of endowed schools for which schemes have been issued; that, in the case of the great public schools, his authority should be confined to that of calling for reports and information; that he should have power to call for an annual report from those universities which receive aid from the State; that the miscellaneous votes for science and art should be moved by him; and that he should be *ex officio* a trustee of the British Museum, and as such be charged with the duty of representing the trustees in Parliament. "Under present circumstances," the Committee report, "it would be undesirable to disturb the existing arrangements as to the Ministerial responsibility for primary education in Ireland." Whatever abstract arguments might be adduced in favour of including Irish education in a general system, most people will agree that the "present circumstances" are hardly favourable for any experiment of the kind. Neither this, however, nor any other detail as to the organization of a Ministry of Education which special circumstances may prompt, at all affects the general question, or ought to blind us to the general advantages of the proposal. Let the main question as to the proper functions of the State towards education be decided, and the means of administering these functions, best suited to the whole country, and to each part of it, will soon be found.

When we consider the evidence laid before the Committee, their main conclusion appears to have been almost inevitable. Some of the witnesses, indeed, saw no reason for a material alteration of the

existing state of things. But even those most opposed to a change confessed that the present system was not logically defensible; that there was a divergence between the real and the nominal authority; that the administration of the various branches corresponding to those which form a Ministry of Education, Science, and Art in other countries, was inharmonious and unorganized; and that, even if the general arrangements were to remain as they are, minor points must be modified, and are, as a fact, being modified, as time goes on. So general, indeed, has been the assent to the conclusion of the Select Committee, that on the 6th of November last Mr. Gladstone only confirmed the prevailing expectation in saying, in answer to a question, "We propose on an early day—I cannot name the day exactly—to adopt measures founded upon the report of the Select Committee."

It seems probable, then, that the unanimous report of the Committee will before long bear fruit in the establishment of a Ministry of Education, and in such a reorganization of the relations of the State to education and science in this country as may provide some authority fitted to embrace within its view the whole range of subjects which this opens up. The report, however, was an unusually short one. It gave few details, and only touched very slightly upon the question which will probably be of most interest for the public: as to what the functions, the aims, and the scope of such a Ministry should be. The moment, therefore, seems not inopportune to inquire what influence such a Ministry may exercise upon the country, where its action may most be called for, and what are likely to be its aims and its results.

A great part of the evidence laid before the Committee related to the internal organization of the Education Department, the distribution of the work, and the division of authority and responsibility between its political chiefs. These are matters which will doubtless receive the attention of those charged with the framing of any measure to be laid before Parliament, but they are matters which concern the public much less than the effect which a Ministry with enlarged powers and well-defined organization may have upon education generally. It is this larger and more important point which we have now to consider, and it will be sufficient, before proceeding to deal with it, to show very shortly what has been the history of the Education Department thus far, and how it contrasts with such an organization, for example, as that of the Ministry of Public Instruction in France.

The first education grant was voted in the year 1832. It amounted to £20,000, and was applied solely in aid of the building of schools. For six years the grant was administered by the Treasury. It was avowedly only an experiment, and when the grant was increased to £30,000, in 1839, a separate department was formed by the establish-

ment, under an Order in Council, of a separate Committee of Privy Council on Education, of which the Lord President of Council naturally became the head. Under this Committee the conditions upon which grants were allowed, at first laid down in separate Minutes, and ultimately embodied in a code, were strictly prescribed, and officers, called Inspectors, were appointed, who were to serve as the eyes of the Department. The annual grants to schools were first established by the Minutes of 1846, and up to that time the Inspectors were charged mainly with the duty of making general reports, studying systems, and suggesting changes. For many years afterwards the system, although more minute in its details, still remained only tentative; the Committee of Council repeatedly expressed its unwillingness to assume the initiative, or to do more than encourage, and perhaps guide, local effort. It was not until the Revised Code, in 1862, established the principle of more strict inspection, and of payment by results, that the nation awoke to the fact that a new and powerful element was gradually introducing itself, without the help of the statute book, into almost every parish throughout the country, and exercising no unimportant influence upon the national life. But the system neither was, nor even aspired to be, complete. Lord Sherbrooke (then Mr. Lowe) said before a committee of the House in 1866 that he had never understood it to be the duty of the Department to extend education throughout the country.

But even while the Committee of Council occupied this neutral, and, as it were, casual position in regard to education, its functions had so increased as to render some more complete organization necessary. In 1856, an Act was passed creating the office of Vice-President of the Committee, who was to represent it in the House of Commons. By the very nature of his office the Vice-President assumed an important position in the administration. While the Lord President had other important functions, not only as a cabinet minister, but as an executive officer, those of the Vice-President were strictly confined to education. As a matter of convenience he represented the Lord President in the House of Commons in regard to other matters, but his statutory duties related to education only, and this very limitation led to the chief management of education being left in his hands. Every increase of the vote increased his responsibility as the representative of the Committee in the House of Commons.

Such continued to be the state of matters till 1870. Several millions had been spent, strict rules had been laid down, large powers of inspection had been assumed; but yet such had been the timidity about State authority that Parliament almost refused to acknowledge that any such authority either existed or was required; and the whole process by which it had grown up was unknown to the statute book except for that one small Act of 1856, which created a Vice-President

of the Committee of Council. The Act of 1870, for the first time, recognised the statutory existence of the Committee by defining it and assigning to it certain functions. So also, in 1872, the Scotch Education Act not only defined, but for the first time gave actual existence to, a separate Committee of Council on Education in Scotland.

At present the authority, such as it is, is undoubtedly vested entirely in these two Committees. The Lord President, as well as the Vice-President, directs the administration, but only, in the eye of the law, as representing that Committee, and with no independent authority whatever. The letters and orders of the Department run in the name of no Minister, but of "My Lords," which is the short form employed to designate the Lords of the Committee of Privy Council. But, on the other hand, the evidence given to the Select Committee shows, that at no time has either Committee exercised any definite authority, or indeed has been summoned except on casual and not very frequent occasions. No quorum is prescribed; no records of proceedings are kept; and even when the advice of certain members has been sought, in view of legislative proposals, they have met rather, perhaps, as a committee of the cabinet than as a Committee of the Privy Council. The practice as regards the composition of the Committees has never been defined, and has varied considerably in regard to the English and Scotch Committees. That for England is composed entirely of certain leading State officers, whose other functions are far too great to allow of their assuming any responsibility for education, or assisting at any deliberations thereon, and whose presence on the Committee is little more than nominal. That for Scotland, on the other hand, has always, since 1878, contained members who were unconnected with the Government; and very recently no less than four such members sat on a Committee of nine.

It is, clear, then, that our educational administration, whether adapted to its purposes or not, has been the result of a gradually developing practice, owing very little to legislative action, and preserving in its present state every possible sign of the absence of deliberate organization. It is quite probable that what looks ill on paper may sometimes work fairly well in practice, and it is doubtless easy to exaggerate the benefits that would result from mere organization; but enough has been said to show that the acknowledged defects of the present system may not have been without their weight in pushing the Select Committee to that recommendation of a Ministry of Education, which on other and weightier grounds was desirable. What is wanted is a central authority, not unduly confined, which may watch our educational progress, may economize its resources, and, without interfering with healthy independence, may supply that guidance and publicity required for their best application. That is

possible only to an authority whose view is not restricted to any one special branch of the subject; and the very extent of its range is a guarantee against its undue interference. It matters little to the public where that authority resides; but a Ministry of Education seems of necessity to imply a Minister. There can be no doubt whatever that the absence of defined and well-understood authority has in this, as in all other spheres, a tendency to cripple the action of the State in regard to all other than primary education, to dissipate its possible influence between various departments which have no natural interest in educational matters, and to lead to that extravagance which is one of the most certain fruits of disorganization.

If we wish to see a system the very opposite of our own, in which a thorough organization tempts those who administer it to push the action of the State to an extreme, we may find it in France. There, it may be said that the University of France, which is but another name for the Ministry of Public Instruction, comprises within its sphere every type and variety of educational or scientific activity in the country, from the College of France down to the humblest village school. From the days of the first Empire, the University has always been presided over by one central authority, formerly the Grand Master of the University, and latterly the Minister of Public Instruction. The actual and immediate functionaries of the Ministry charged with the central administration, are divided into three *Directions*, those of Primary, Secondary, and Higher Education.¹ By these the State subvention is distributed, the salaries of teachers are fixed, the general rules and decrees regarding educational matters are administered, and the general system of inspection is carried out through the *Inspecteurs Généraux*. Side by side with the executive officials there stands the *Conseil Supérieur*, meeting for consultation twice a year. It is composed of about sixty members, some elected, and some nominated by the Minister. But its chief functions are discharged by the *Section Permanente*, which consists of fifteen members selected by the Minister. The central authority has thus no lack of organization. But this is far from marking the limit of the functions of the State. The centre of the administration is in these three *Directions* of the Ministry, each independent in itself and working under the immediate authority of the Minister; but the State also appoints and controls the local authorities. The whole University of France, including Algiers, is divided into seventeen *Académies*. Each of these *Académies* is presided over by a *Recteur*,²

(1) It is unnecessary to enter into strictly administrative details, such as the *Direction de la Comptabilité* and the *Direction du Secrétariat*, which have no connection with the special functions of the Ministry of Education.

(2) In the case of Paris the Minister is nominal *Recteur*; the real functions of this—perhaps the most important educational post in France—are in the hands of M. Gréard, the *Vice-Recteur*.

who has under him the *Inspecteurs d'Académie*. All of these are appointed by, and responsible to, the Minister, and through them the State effectively controls the whole local management of the secondary as well as the primary schools, not less than the central supervision. There is associated with them an Academical Council, whose functions are purely consultative, and a proportion of whose members are nominees of the Minister. Within the Academy, again, there are so many *Départements*, each with its separate organization for higher, secondary, and primary education, each with a Departmental Council, partly nominated by the Minister, and each supplied with a separate staff of *Inspecteurs Primaires*, appointed in every case by the Minister. Certain functions in regard to the primary and secondary schools are performed by the prefects, and by the municipal councils; but, on the whole, it may be accurately said that the local initiative, the local management and control, the programmes of the schools, and the administration of their income, are almost as completely in the hands of the State as is the central administration in the Rue de Grenelle. It is in this lack of local initiative and co-operation that the weakness of the French administration consists.

There are probably few, even amongst the extreme advocates of organization, who would not dread the importation of such a system as this into England, and the last to advise us to adopt it as it stands would be some of those who now take a leading part in its administration in France. The two countries are now standing at opposite poles, and France is certainly suffering, on the confession of those who know best, from over-centralisation as much as we are from the want of organization, by which the educational resources of the country are dissipated. The very strength of our intellectual activity as a nation has been due to its variety, and there is a healthy, though perhaps an overstrained anxiety, lest organization should lead us into a mechanical routine. We have hitherto, it may be said, submitted to no hard and fast rules; we have aimed at no centralised unity; we have trusted to voluntary and individual initiative, and, in spite of shortcomings, those who defend the present state of things may point with pride to not a little educational activity and earnestness. About two-thirds of our primary education, it may be urged, is still due to voluntary initiative, encouraged by State grants, but itself independent of State authority; our secondary education represents every variety of origin, organization, and aims, except those which are due to the State; and yet our great public schools, whatever their critics may say, offer a training for life, quite apart from their mere educational equipment, for which Frenchmen long in vain. So also higher education with us depends solely upon resources to which the State has contributed scarcely anything, and is guided by influences with which the State is in no way associated. The English nation,

it may further be objected, resents anything in the shape of a bureaucracy. It knows how easily an intolerable tyranny can grow up behind the rigid and impenetrable organization of a State Department. It is aware how, under that organization, the private citizen finds himself enveloped in a system too complicated to be resisted, how soon those by whom it is administered find themselves fortified behind a strong wall of rules, and precedents, and statutory regulations, through which the uninitiated strive in vain to break. The Englishman fears that he may fall the more completely under this thralldom, inasmuch as he is conscious of being unduly impatient of the trouble of making himself acquainted with the system of his own government, which seems to have an interest only for those charged with its administration. It is a matter of ordinary experience, for instance, that few who have not some special reason for knowing it, take the trouble to understand our educational system as it now exists, could explain the simplest principles that regulate the relations between the locality and the State, or could tell by what different agencies the schools in each locality may be provided or attendance thereat enforced. This very ignorance affords, no doubt, exactly the opportunity by which bureaucratic authority may profit for the extension of its own powers.

This jealousy and dread of an undue increase of central authority in England is no unhealthy symptom, and how deeply-rooted it is, may be judged from the fact that it has been nowhere more conspicuously shown than in the policy pursued by the Education Department ever since its formation. At first the operations of the Department were carefully proclaimed to be tentative only; the Inspectors were sedulously instructed as to the limitation of their duties, and the necessity of no undue interference with local authority. Even when Mr. Forster introduced his Bill of 1870, he was careful to lay down the principles of restricting State agency to the supplementing of existing school provision, and of maintaining local initiative and local control. As a fact, indeed, the jealousy of a bureaucracy is so marked in this country that it has diffused itself over every branch of administration, and it may be said, without fear of contradiction, that State interference is far more often invited, and, indeed, entreated by a locality, than offered or accorded by the central authority. The fear, then, is far more imaginary than real. There are safeguards against it, in the traditions and sentiments of English political and social life, far too strong to be overcome by any superimposed system, and certain to insure a continuance of the policy of abstention wherever abstention is possible. Allowing for all the advantages which have been gained by the free and independent growth of our educational institutions, it has still to be proved that anything of value would be lost through a central organization which would secure only that publicity essential to test

real efficiency, and to convict imposture. And when we examine more closely the actual state of education, and the probable functions of a Ministry, it may well appear that in our nervous fear of centralisation, we are neglecting the dictates of common sense and forgetting the certain benefits of reasonable organization. Might not these be very easily secured at present without loss of that elasticity of action, for which all admit that we must necessarily trust to a due amount of freedom and independence? Is it not, indeed, more than doubtful whether we are not paving the way, by our timidity and neglect, for a rigidity of system hereafter far greater than that which some amongst us now profess to dread?

Besides the supposed danger of undue interference, it is possible that a dread of increased expenditure, with the probable result of a violent reaction, may not be without its influence upon many who look with suspicion on the recommendation of the Select Committee. It ought in truth to be amongst the strongest motives for the adoption of their proposal. No one opposes educational expenditure, so long as it is certain that it is well adjusted, that it is producing the best possible results, and that we are not spending money in doing what ought to be done by other means. Discontent and grumbling are heard only when it is feared that we are multiplying useless agencies, are extravagant with one hand and niggardly with the other, that we are blindly fooling our way, and are uncertain as to the end at which we aim. If the State can be sure that her educational expenditure is prudently and evenly distributed, there is no expenditure for which the returns are so certain and so speedy, none which will so well repay her in added security under the pressure of danger. Let us once feel confident that this expenditure is wisely adjusted, and that the development of our resources is proceeding with the steadiness that a wide range of view alone can give, and discontent will surely cease or will be quickly silenced. But let the feeling gain ground that we are advancing without counting the cost, without measuring our steps, without looking around and ahead of us, and discontent will then have such arguments at its back as for the first time may make it dangerous. Whether it be to avoid extravagance, or to escape the reaction which will undo what has been already done, it is alike needful that the State should organize its own educational authority, and should commit the responsibility for its combined and harmonious action into definite hands.

The functions of an Education Minister fall naturally into three parts, those of primary and of secondary education, and the more varied sphere of higher education, including the cognate branches of Science and Art. Speaking generally, we may say that the Education Department, as now constituted, touches only upon the first of the three; and perhaps to a very limited extent upon the teaching of Science and Art, so

far as these are industrial.¹ For all practical purposes, then, the State concerns itself only with primary education, or, in other words, with that part of education of which the intellectual influence is smallest, and where the subject is least open to debate. But even here we may readily forget how slight is the influence of the State; for the most part the control exercised is only an indirect one. The Education Department may, indeed, intervene in certain cases under the Act of 1870 and the other Acts which have followed it. The Department has certain powers of sanction, may issue certain orders, and may occasionally enforce action upon a local authority, or even supersede it if in default. But nine-tenths of the ordinary work of the local authorities is carried out with no interference whatever from headquarters. The chief control which the State can exercise is through the indirect machinery of the grant, and even this is administered according to the strictly defined conditions of a Code annually submitted to Parliament. Yet it may be doubted whether such indirect control is not, more than any other, subject to misconstruction, and liable to press unduly in certain cases quite apart from the intentions of those who exercise it. Take, for example, the much-vexed question of over-pressure. Supposing that such over-pressure were proved to exist, the blame would not rest with the Department. Local managers are responsible for the organization of their schools, and it is for them to adapt the instruction to the powers and capacities of the scholars. So long as they can show their schools to be efficient they are not compelled to present a single scholar to the Inspector according to the arrangements prescribed in the Code, or in such a way as to earn a grant. If they are willing to dispense with that grant, they are perfectly free to arrange their classes and the subjects taught in them in any way that seems good to them. The consequence is that the Department and the local managers, instead of being able satisfactorily to settle whether over-pressure exists, are tempted rather to throw the blame for it on one another. "We must obey the Code," say the managers, "because if we do not, we throw upon the rates a burden which they cannot be expected to bear." "If we bring the Standard down to the lowest level," says the Department, "then we simply convert the grant into an unconditional subvention to the local rates. It is for us to lay down a Code which is in accordance with the most mature views on the subject. It is for you to say what part of the conditions you can fulfil with due regard to the circumstances of the scholars under your charge." The question is a knotty one, but the occasions for recriminations and misunderstandings might be materially lessened were there some organized authority which could bring about a closer

(1) The Scotch Education Acts embrace a large part of the Secondary Education of the country; but, as we shall see presently, the functions which the Scotch Education Department has been able to exercise in regard to it have been very slight.

relation between the centre and the localities, and insure their harmonious action.

So far as regards primary education, however, the sphere is now so fully occupied, that no great change is probable in its relations to the State. What a Ministry of Education might be expected to do in regard to it is rather to deal with questions that loom in the not distant future. Is education to be free? If the discussions which have been started on the subject should lead to this result, what authority is to regulate the future position of the voluntary schools which will be so largely affected by the change? Or, again, are we to see a gradual, but steady increase of the grants in aid, and are we to be content with congratulating ourselves, year by year, that we are making real educational progress, because we continue to add so many hundreds of thousands annually to these grants? If any limit is to be fixed, upon what principle is it to be settled? Are payments still to be made upon results? If this principle be abandoned, who is to impose the definite and fixed rules of organization, which inevitably must take its place, unless the efficiency of primary education is to be left to chance? All these are questions that have already arisen, and which will soon call for solutions. Are they to be settled merely by the cumbrous method of temporary Commissions of Inquiry, who have to begin their investigations by learning facts familiar to the initiated? Or are we to hope for some definite authority whose business it shall be to watch the development of educational questions, and to submit proposals for dealing with all such problems as they arise?

But if a Ministry of Education is wanted even for primary education, much more is it called for when we take the step in advance to secondary education. It is more than twenty years since Mr. Arnold first pleaded for such a Ministry on behalf of the middle class. Since then we have had Endowed Schools Commissions; we have had the Oxford and Cambridge middle-class examinations; and we have had a new life breathed into many of the old grammar schools. But it is idle to say that the deficiency is yet filled up; its extent, indeed, has only been made more clear. The very activity and earnestness which have been shown in the work, and the strength of the demand which the middle class have now learned to make on their own behalf, have proved further organization to be now an imperative necessity. We may set aside, just as Mr. Arnold set aside twenty years ago, the case of the great public schools. These schools have, and always will have, their critics. They would be the last to object to what is a necessary part of their existence as great public institutions, which England takes the trouble to criticise just because she is proud of them. The Select Committee have, therefore, done well to propose nothing more than that schools like these should make a report to the

Minister when called upon to do so. There is just as little reason to interfere with the best of the private schools, which give the surest and most public proofs of their efficiency, but which meet the wants, after all, of only the smallest handful of the nation. What we are concerned with is the better organization of those secondary schools which are to meet the needs of the middle class. If our great public schools are to remain what they are, there ought to be none more forward than they in the effort so to organize our enormous resources as to satisfy the just demands of the middle class. Unless these demands are otherwise met, the public schools, to their loss, may be obliged to step down to meet them. They have nothing to fear from publicity. They have everything to fear from neglect. Already the desire of the middle class for better education has had results, which are no doubt good in themselves, although the methods of their operations have by some been thought open to criticism. To meet this desire higher-grade primary schools are increasing every day. In the larger towns of Scotland they have for years been common, and unless something is soon done to revive the secondary schools they will become more common still. The manufacturing towns of England are not only following in the same course, but sometimes carrying it further. Of the intellectual stimulus which such schools produce there cannot be any doubt. Too strict a limitation of the primary school would impose a bar upon the progress of the poorest children, which would be no economy of our resources. But it has been doubted by some whether these higher-grade primary schools are not doing a work which should in great measure be done by other agency. Even so sound a friend of education as Bishop Temple has felt himself obliged to utter a protest. The School Boards who establish such schools admit that they are for a class above the poor, and that they are attended by those from whom a higher fee could easily be obtained, were it not that the higher fee would deprive the school, not of the grant only, but of *inspection*. There can be no greater proof of the advance made by the middle class in their ideas of education than their insistence upon inspection as a proof of the efficiency of a school. Hard experience has taught them that their children, educated for £8 or £10 a year at the "Classical and Commercial Academy," are not fit to meet on equal terms the children of the working classes trained in the inspected school, and they have accordingly discarded the "Academy," and require that, paying rates, they should also have the benefit of the efficiency which is to be found in rate-supported schools. They have no wish to avoid paying a reasonable fee, and would willingly pay more than the code limit of 9d. a week if they did not thereby lose the right to inspection. They would accept the proof of efficiency without the grant in aid; but as inspection can be got only with the grant, they are not so foolish as to refuse both because they cannot

get the one without the other. Several of the larger School Boards in Scotland have for seven years been begging to have the secondary or burgh schools, which are under the management of the Boards, inspected by the Scotch Education Department, but the Department has been obliged to refuse their urgent invitation, because the function was not one which was held by the Treasury to come within the province of the Department. The School Boards make no secret of the fact that hundreds of parents are thereby driven to the cheaper schools, where they get the benefit of the grant. Can there be any proof more palpable of what we lose by not having a Ministry which could organize, test, and stimulate the education of the middle classes, which are now being driven out of the secondary schools into the elementary, and which may well absorb to themselves in time the advantages of the elementary schools, established chiefly for the benefit of the poorest class? We have revised endowments, we have established the endowed schools upon a new footing, we have prescribed their programmes. But having done so, from the fact that no proper educational authority has been constituted which could keep an outlook on the whole educational field, we leave it absolutely to chance to decide whether the programmes are followed, whether the school has any pupils, whether the endowments are applied in accordance with the scheme. The Endowed Schools Commissioners have set before themselves two types of schools—one the classical school which may form a stepping-stone to the university, and the other the commercial or modern school.¹ But there is no certainty that the distinction, which may have been carefully adapted to the wants of each locality, shall be preserved. We are apt to fear monotony from organization, but there is no monotony so absolute and so deadening as that which comes from unorganized imitation. The master of the grammar school is always apt to fancy himself the colleague of the head master of Eton; and because it is supposed to add to his dignity, he preserves the tradition of a decayed classical school because no central authority can transform him into something better and more useful, and thereafter require him to adhere to the transformation.

The truth is that this inspection of the endowed schools is a matter which admits of no delay. So far as Scotland is concerned, the Educational Endowments Act of 1882 made such inspection necessary in the case of endowed schools; and the Scotch Department, hitherto confined to primary inspection, is consequently confronted with the task of inspecting secondary schools. But England still stands where it was. Years ago she held back because it was asserted that the middle class disliked interference, and because interference, it was supposed, would produce monotony. The middle class itself has fal-

(1) Corresponding to the French *Lycée* on the one hand, and to the *École Spéciale* on the other.

sified these assertions, and asks that the State shall give a guarantee of efficiency. We have attempted reform; we have attempted it in a half-hearted way; yet all the good, such as it is, which reform has accomplished has been due to its giving a certain amount of organization. And now, from our dread of enforcing this organization, we are standing aloof, and allow the results of our efforts to drift as they may. How long is this *gran rifiuto* to continue? We have attempted, as a State, to delegate our duties. We have pushed them off upon the universities, who can, after all, overtake but a fragment of the duty, and who have no power to insist upon publicity, or organization, or even attention to a prescribed programme. We are invited to come forward, and are assured that intervention is not feared. We are informed that the want of inspection by the State is emptying the endowed schools, and forcing School Boards to build alongside of them other schools which shall receive grants, and have the advantage of the best educational guidance available, while the endowed schools remain untested, immovable, and useless. Is there anything but the veriest pedantry in this dread of State intervention, simply because it may produce a monotony against which all our social habits, all our national feelings, all the security of local control, most effectually defend us? The schools have their own endowments, which do not exist in France. They have their own governing bodies, unknown in France. The teacher holds his office not at the will of the State, as is the case in France. We cannot possibly destroy local independence. But we can help it, stimulate it, guide it, and apply to it the test for which it asks. We refuse to do so because of an imaginary bugbear of monotony, which it is supposed will be the result of the action of an organized Ministry of Education.

But there are, besides the organization of secondary schools, other functions of a nature more delicate, from which a Ministry of Education could not stand aloof. The field of university education cannot remain unknown to it. Whatever may be the relations of the State to the older universities, resting, as they do, entirely upon their traditions, their vast authority and reputation, and their wealth, yet it is certain that the State has assumed to itself an authority, as yet undefined, with respect to them; that through a Department, other than the Education Department, it has made itself a final legislative court for them; that it has gone hand in hand with the promoters of the recent extension of the university system; and we cannot suppose that its operations in this direction are to be brought suddenly to a close. The State has established a university in London, whose function it is now proposed to extend from examination to teaching. Funds, entirely at the disposal of the State, have lately been applied to found the Royal University of Ireland. Charters have been granted to the Victoria University and to the Colleges of Wales; and it was only

by the accident of the connection of the Education Department with the Privy Council, that the terms of these charters came within the view of the Education Department, with whose functions that of granting such charters has nothing whatever to do. If a college seeks to establish itself as an ordinary company, without adding the word "Limited" to its name, it must apply to the Railway Department of the Board of Trade. If a grant is made to the Royal Society for purposes of research, there is no educational authority which has any knowledge of the fact, or can express any opinion as to its bearing upon the educational or scientific interests of the country as a whole. The vote for the British Museum is brought forward by a private member of the House, who happens to be a trustee, and is arranged between the trustees, who have no necessary government responsibility, and the Treasury, who have no necessary educational or scientific knowledge or interest. The operations of the Civil Service Commissioners are producing a great change in the whole methods of education, higher and lower, but they are as absolutely dissociated from any educational authority exercised by the State, as if no such authority existed. In short, the State is moving forward in this sphere of work, with ever-increasing responsibilities, with new tasks thrust upon her, with fresh interests to be encouraged, keener competition to meet, and more imperative need for stimulating all energies; and yet her means for the public encouragement of science and for the development of education remain as little organized and as much wanting in unity as they were, when for the first time she perceived, nearly half a century ago, that any such task was before her. On every side her operations are increasing; and yet so timid is she as to the effect of her own action, that she seems to adopt every means of concealing that she has any such function at all. If State interference is dangerous, is it rendered less dangerous by being exercised through a dozen channels, instead of being concentrated in one responsible administration?

In any system of organization which may ultimately be adopted, it is not likely that we shall attempt to imitate too closely the French model. Those, as has been already said, who are concerned with its administration, know how complicated it is, and would be the last to counsel such indiscriminating imitation. But there is one part of it which we might with advantage adopt. As we have seen, the authority of the Education Department is legally vested in the Committees of Council, apart from whom the really responsible Ministers nominally possess no power. But such a committee can obviously exercise no executive functions; while its constitution (being made up of the leading members of the Cabinet) renders it unfit for ordinary consultative purposes. But it is precisely for consultative purposes that any council associated with a Minister of Education ought pro-

perly to exist; while it should be cut off, in name as well as in fact, from all executive functions. We have what might serve as a model for such a council in the *Conseil Supérieur* of the French Ministry. In a few matters that council exercises a judicial authority which it would probably be better without; but for the most part it confines itself to advice and deliberation at the regular periods of its meetings. In the Permanent Section of the council the Minister has constantly at his hand a committee, which in no way interferes with his responsibility, and which ought, if properly organized, to introduce no delay or friction into the machinery, but which may serve admirably to keep him in touch of the feeling of the leading educational authorities of the country, being composed of men sufficiently apart from the executive to be independent, and yet sufficiently acquainted with the working of the educational machine to be practically useful. Modified to suit our wants, such a council or committee could not but be of infinite use to a Minister of Education, in the serious task that must lie before him. It must be for him to apply the influence of the State throughout the whole sphere of educational activity, with sufficient force to guide, to stimulate, and to enlighten, but with sufficient moderation to avoid harassing interference and prevent the necessity of having to reckon, as enemies, with the forces of independent opinion, variety in local requirements, and a healthy resistance to mechanical routine. It must be his to show how the organized operations of the State can bring to the development of her own resources, not the meddlesome officiousness of a vexatious bureaucracy, nor the ill-digested scheming of crotchet-mongers, but the combined and measured force of civilized society, that "partnership in all science, in all art, in every virtue, in all perfection," which it is the chief function of the State to express. These are the words of Burke. May we not, at this moment, add, with some urgency, "a partnership that may help us to all prudence, all courage, and all strength"?

HENRY CRAIK.

SOCIAL SCIENCE ON THE STAGE.

It is certainly not necessary that to every play, as to every fable, a moral easily deducible from it should be attached; though every play that presents a true picture of life must almost as a matter of course teach some lesson. *Othello* is the drama of jealousy, *Macbeth* the drama of ambition, *Romeo and Juliet* the drama of passionate love; but it was not to show the danger of jealousy, of ambition, or of passionate love, that these dramas were written. A picture of the "green-eyed monster," in all its hideousness, occurs in the first; a reflection on the futility of "vaulting ambition" in the second; and a warning of the "violent ends" produced by "violent delights" in the third. The moral purpose of the play, supposing such a purpose to exist, is not, however, in either case made obvious. In numbers of the most successful plays of modern France, on the other hand, we find a moral thesis adopted beforehand and deliberately worked out by dramatic means. This moral thesis does not necessarily embody a high moral notion. It may be, and often is, paradoxical in character. The one thing essential is that it shall assert a principle, and present a case of as dramatic a character as possible in illustration of it. The moral which, as before remarked, belongs to every incident in life, is not always an evident one; nor in the finest works of art does the moral ever lie conspicuously on the surface. But if a vivacious comedy or a dramatic play is specially intended to teach or rather to prove something, it is as well that there should be no mistake about it; and in these cases the audience is generally informed in the first act of what in the succeeding acts the author proposes to demonstrate. A French drama of incidents has often no moral beyond the familiar—not to say vulgar—one that virtue prospers and vice does not; and though each of Victor Hugo's dramas teaches some special lesson it might sometimes be difficult, but for the preface, to discover it. Numbers of French dramas, however, deal not only with the facts of life but also in an explicit manner with its theories, and though often immoral are constructed on what may be called a moral basis.

In that edifying work, the *Pink Dominoes*, for instance, the complicated and certainly very ingenious intrigue which forms the substance of the piece has its origin in an argument between two ladies, one a thorough Parisian, the other a simple-minded and rather backward provincial, as to the true nature and appropriate treatment of husbands. A husband, according to the Parisian lady, is never perfect; and the wise wife is she who pardons his "slight slips 'gainst *bonos mores*," and, to avoid driving him to humiliating subterfuges and denials,

pretends even not to see them. In the long run a husband will be grateful to such a wife, and she may be sure in a general way of his fidelity and affection; whereas to a wife too vigilant and too implacable he will be obliged to behave with a duplicity which, reacting upon his own sensitive nature, will make him despise himself and detest her.

A good many modern French plays are in fact pamphlets in dramatic form; and some of them have suffered as works of art from having been too evidently written with a purpose. The dramatist who wishes to prove the truth of a proposition put forward by himself will of course make his characters act as it is necessary they should act in order to give the desired result. He must not violate probability in too flagrant a manner, and his play will scarcely succeed if the dénouement seems altogether unnatural; but even while observing these conditions he may, and usually does, so mould his personages as to make them quite exceptional; though it is with these exceptional personages that he works towards establishing his general rule. The interesting thing, however, in connection with the moral and philosophical plays of modern France is not any lesson that they teach, but the fact that such plays exist, showing as it does that the theatre in France is much more than a place of amusement. It is a place of discussion, in which every question that agitates society is treated, and often in several different pieces from several different points of view. Absurdities of the day (such as those of æstheticism) are satirised no doubt on our own stage. But the social questions dealt with on the French stage are often of a far graver character than any connected with dress. This was the case even with M. Sardou's *Famille Benoiton*, notoriously a costume piece, and dependent in a large measure for its success on its amusing exaggerations of the exaggerated costumes of the day. But it was more than that. It touched upon many other follies akin to that of exaggeration in dress; and was really a stage echo of M. Dupin's celebrated pamphlet on *Le Luxe effréné des Femmes*. M. Sardou's exhilarating picture of the unbridled luxury of women called for no reply, and in fact admitted of none. His eloquent apostrophe to white muslin, "O sainte mousseline," was criticised in the press on economical grounds, the work of "getting up" a muslin dress being neither so simple nor so inexpensive as M. Sardou had imagined. But admitting the existence of the evils that he attacked it was impossible to defend them. Similarly when, in the lively days of 1848, *La Propriété c'est le Vol* was brought out, and the serpent of Eden was presented on the stage with the hat and spectacles and the very physiognomy of M. Proudhon, it was not likely that any dramatist would take the part of the Socialist and seek to represent individualism as ridiculous. The "right to labour" is asserted in this same piece by a dentist

without patients, who insists as a matter of principle on pulling out the teeth of the first person he meets. This again could be met by no counter-presentation from a socialistic point of view, nor would the Government have permitted it; for despite the article in the *Constitution* of 1830, declaring that "the censorship is abolished and cannot be re-established," it has never been found possible to dispense in France with stage censorship, which, temporarily set aside as a result of some revolutionary movement, has always been re-established before long. So necessary, indeed, had it become under the second French Republic, to restrain the Aristophanic tendencies of the newly emancipated dramatists, that the censorship went to extremes, and not content with prohibiting political subjects interfered with social subjects also. Thus it was under the second French Republic that the younger Dumas' sympathetic picture of the woman who has gone astray (*La Traviata*, as she is considerably called in the Italian version of the play) was objected to by the censorship, nor was it until the Empire that *La Dame aux Camélias* could be brought out.

It would probably be a mistake to see in this piece any deliberate attempt to raise up the fallen woman. The play was only a dramatic version of a novel by the same author for which the subject had been furnished by the life and death of a certain Marie Duplessis—whose story Dickens, becoming acquainted with it during a visit to Paris, had at one time proposed to treat. *La Dame aux Camélias* was in any case destined to achieve such popularity that for a time the class to which the heroine belongs became invested with unusual interest. Vice by being represented as consumptive lost all its grossness; but no sooner had the play attained its maximum of success than the discovery was made that it rested on a wrong moral basis. It "rehabilitated the courtesan;" and M. Théodore Barrière, assisted by the inevitable collaborateur, undertook to set matters right by exhibiting that objectionable personage in her true colours. The outcome of this undertaking was *Les Filles de Marbre*: too fine a name for them according to Théophile Gautier, who preferred as a substitute *Les Filles de Plâtre*. Instead of dying of love, complicated by phthisis, with claims to forgiveness based on her having "loved much," the leading lady of M. Barrière's piece reduced her lover to poverty and despair, unconsciously ruined his talent, and consciously insulted him when she could no longer extort money from him. The God this young woman avowedly worshipped was not love but gold. She was without pity, without remorse; nor did the author think fit to place in contrast with her a more amiable specimen of depravity—even as Dumas has placed side by side with his tender-hearted Marguerite Gauthier, the selfish and ignoble Prudence. Marco, the chief of the *Girls of Marble*, is doubtless a much more common character in the world than Marguerite Gauthier; and Balzac, who

knew the world, had anticipated in only one of his characters—the unfortunate Coralie—all the best points in Marguerite Gauthier, whereas he had anticipated in half-a-dozen different characters, from Madame de Marneffe downward, the worst points in Marco. But though Marco may have been a good deal truer to nature than Marguerite Gauthier she was far less interesting; and the picture of a fallen woman saved by an access of genuine feeling was much more agreeable than that of a degraded one dragging to his destruction a miserably weak man.

The *Girls of Marble* seemed, however, to M. Léon Laya too hard, too cold; and to show that women might lead irregular lives, and yet be kind and generous, he wrote *Les Cœurs d'Or*. Here two young women, attached by anti-matrimonial ties to two young men, find that they are preventing them from making suitable marriages in a decent sphere of life. The young men know what, in a worldly point of view, they ought to do, but are restrained by good feeling and the remembrance of past affection from doing it. The young women, however, resolve to sacrifice themselves. They take the initiative in breaking off the connection, and by doing so prove that they have "hearts of gold." This sentimental piece, written in the style called "honnête," did not meet with anything like the success of the highly emotional *Dame aux Camélias*, or of the cynical *Filles de Marbre*; nor did it close the stage discussion as to the goodness or badness of a particular class of women—a discussion which, indeed, might have been carried on for an indefinite time, seeing that the class in question comprises a great number of different specimens, from Cleopatra—that "reino entretenue," as Heine called her—to the Esther of Balzac's *Splendeurs et Misères d'une Courtisane*.

Then arose the question—suggested, no doubt, by M. Laya's *Cœurs d'Or*—whether a woman really possessing a heart of gold ought to be abandoned whenever it suited the convenience or the caprice of her lover to get rid of her. M. Léon Gozlan took one view of the matter and M. Emile Augier the other; the former developing his ideas on the subject in a single act, the latter in a full-sized drama. In Léon Gozlan's charming little piece, *La Fin du Roman, ou Comment on se débarasse d'une Maîtresse*, a young man is represented as so hopelessly attached to a young woman whom he has omitted to marry, that his friends, as "men of the world," think it necessary to speak to him on the subject. The attachment has lasted a considerable time, and it is explained to him that it will be mere weakness on his part to allow it to continue any longer. He is invited to join a travelling party to Italy, and is mockingly told that he will want to bring his mistress with him. He repels the taunt, and, in response to the suggestion of one of his friends, makes a bet on the subject. The separation having been decided on, a division of household effects

takes place. Difficulties arise about the appropriation of certain objects to which a sentimental interest belongs, and which each, from regard for the other, wishes to retain. A favourite dog is disputed for ; and when it is arranged that he shall be the property of the one he goes to most willingly, the faithful animal hesitates between the two, and maintains an attitude of strict but friendly neutrality. Lastly, there is a child's miniature which neither will consent to part with ; and thus, little by little, the impossibility of the separation is made manifest. The young man takes the young woman with him to Italy. But he wins his bet all the same, for he is accompanied not by his mistress but by his wife.

As a counterpart to this work, in which an immoral situation is rectified by the simplest means, may be taken M. Emile Augier's *Mariage d'Olympe*, in which a similar situation is, by similar means, made to yield terrible and tragic results. Only M. Augier's young woman happens to be not at all the same sort of person as M. Gozlan's young woman ; so that whereas to abandon the one would have been culpable and foolish, to introduce the other into decent society was reckless and criminal.

Dumas showed before long a disposition to turn, not against his own views, but of views supposed to be his. Whatever allowances might be made for a woman in the position of Marguerite Gauthier, a real wife ought not, according to his very original idea, to deceive her husband. He exhibited, in *Diane de Lys*, a lady who took this liberty, and who was shot in consequence by her justly indignant spouse.

M. Dumas' *Fils Naturel*, in which a father disavows his son, until at last the young man finds himself in such a position that he can in his turn disavow his father, gave rise to a good many pieces on the same subject. The half-dozen or dozen plays in which it is shown that irregular relations between men and women are likely to have awkward consequences, are, as studies of social problems, scarcely worth dwelling upon. Every one knows that (as in *La Fiammina*) the son of a prima donna who has misconducted herself may find difficulties in his way when he proposes to marry a girl whose parents are eminently respectable ; and we need no sensational dramatist to teach us (as in *Coralie*), that an officer whose mother has amassed a large fortune by the most shameful means may, in spite of his personal merits, meet with slights and indignities.

M. Emile Augier's *Gendre de M. Poirier* started the son-in-law as a dramatic subject. In this comedy, one of the best of modern times, a rich bourgeois has married his daughter to a penniless aristocrat, who directs the household in such a sumptuous style that the father-in-law finds himself in a fair way of being ruined. To this a sort of counterpart was furnished by M. Augier himself in *Un Beau Mariage* ;

which, while sparing fathers-in-law, exposes the thoughtlessness of some mothers-in-law who expect their daughters' husbands, not only to take charge of their affairs, but to accompany them to evening parties and balls. This to a serious-minded young man would doubtless be a great trial; and in M. Augier's comedy the end of the matter is that the husband leaves the house of his rich mother-in-law, and, followed at a very dramatic crisis by his wife, supports himself by the exercise of his talents as a chemist, mechanician, and inventor. The mother-in-law, even when she possesses the advantage of being rich, is not a popular character on the French stage; nor, apparently, on the Spanish stage either. There is, at all events, a modern Spanish comedy, called *The Meadow Coat* (the rough coat, that is to say, of the untrained, unclipped horse), in which, as in *Un Beau Mariage*, a rustic husband who rises early meets, on coming down in the morning, his wife and mother returning from a late ball. In M. Augier's corresponding scene the husband has been reading and writing all night when the two ladies in their ball dresses suddenly burst upon his solitude.

Le Gendre de M. Poirier, too, was the progenitor, or at least the caller-into-existence, of another son-in-law piece called *Les Petites Mains*, in which a son-in-law of fashionable tastes and habits, but without money of his own, is harshly treated by a father-in-law, who insists upon his adopting some occupation, and who ultimately, by dint of persecution and misrepresentation, separates him from his wife and forces him to become clerk and touter to a house agent. The moral of this amusing little comedy is not quite apparent to the unspectacled eye. The semi-burlesque proposition on which it rests is, however, to the effect that men with large hands are intended by nature to make money, and men with small hands to spend it. The piece belongs in any case to the son-in-law series, in which, by its entertaining qualities, it may claim to hold an honourable place.

The latest social subject dealt with by French dramatists has been the fertile one of divorce, which M. Sardou has treated both seriously and comically. Before *Odette* and *Dirorçons*, he had, however, written the less known *Daniel Rochat*, which ends with a divorce in Switzerland, the divorced persons being of course citizens of the Helvetic Republic; and though the main subject of *Daniel Rochat* is the union, followed immediately afterwards by the separation, of two persons who are prevented from living together as husband and wife by incompatibility of religious convictions, it may all the same be classed with M. Sardou's other divorce pieces. The author lets it be seen that the mistake made by *Daniel Rochat* can easily be remedied in Switzerland, a country where divorce is easy; whereas it would have been without remedy in France, where divorce was at that time impossible. The case, however, though an effective one for the dramatist

—at least for such a dramatist as M. Sardou—is of too exceptional a character to merit attention from the dramatic moralist or legist.

The practice of treating subjects of the day in dramatic form is one which, from a purely artistic point of view, cannot be commended. The process involves almost necessarily forced motives and distorted characters. Works, too, produced on this system must, from the nature of the case, be of ephemeral interest. Who, for instance, now that France, like England, Germany, and the United States, has a law of divorce, can care for pieces in which the interest turns upon the iniquity of treating as indissoluble every contract, to whatever painful consequences it may have led, which has once been signed in presence of Monsieur le Maire? In Shakespeare and Molière so little are affairs of the day touched upon (without ever being made the subject of an entire work) that a reader might find it difficult to determine from internal evidence at what period either of these writers lived. The characteristic talk of *Les Précieuses* is about the only indication in the case of Molière of the time to which the piece belongs. There is scarcely a work, on the other hand, from the pen of M. Sardou (who may be taken as the representative comedy writer of modern France) which does not bear the impress and colour of the time, and which (especially in the case of his later pieces) does not in a very direct manner reproduce the incidents or reflect the ideas of the life around him. If immediate and striking success with a Paris audience be the author's aim, it must be admitted that M. Sardou's method is more effective than that of his predecessor, Scribe, whose comedies are masterpieces of ingenuity, but are for the most part independent of place and time. Many of Scribe's pieces have been quite as successful in England as in France. This cannot be said of any of Sardou's plays, with the solitary exception of "*Les Pattes de Mouche*," one of his earliest works, written at a time when Scribe was still his model. But so far as Paris at the present moment is concerned, M. Sardou hits the mark, and hits it harder than ever Scribe did.

The stage in France would be used for the discussion of political as well as social questions, did the censorship permit it. Of this we had a sign in M. Sardou's *Rabagas*, produced soon after the Commune, in various pieces brought out during the revolutionary days of 1848, and in *Les Cosaques*, which, after being previously rejected by the censorship, was authorised for representation just before the outbreak of the Crimean war, when, as a matter of policy, antagonism to Russia was encouraged and stimulated by the Government. As a rule, however, no performance likely to call forth manifestations of political feeling, or to give offence to a friendly State, or to its people, is allowed. M. Sardou's *L'oncle Sam* was objected to as calculated to hurt the feelings of the Americans; and the authors of a little piece called *L'Étrangère*—not to be confounded with the five-act comedy

of the same name—were required to change it because (as set forth in a document which figures among the *Papiers secrets de l'Empire*) numbers of foreigners visit Paris and might be annoyed at seeing the leading character of the very objectionable little piece put forward as a typical lady from abroad! All social questions of the day have, however, for the last thirty years been left freely to the dramatist to treat as he may think fit. Or it may be that such questions have always been left to him, and that it is only during the last quarter of a century or so that he has thought fit to occupy himself with them.

The true character of women who have none was the first theme to be treated controversially, with examples in lieu of arguments; then the desirability of getting married in certain cases where the marriage ceremony had been dispensed with; then, in due time, the rights of natural children and their compromising effect in connection with mothers proposing to lead a new life. The son-in-law question—of such slight interest to Englishmen—had meantime sprung up; and the quiet, studious son-in-law, bullied by his wife's mother; the fashionably extravagant son-in-law, devouring the substance of his wife's father; the idle but well-meaning son-in-law, misunderstood by every one, were turn by turn exhibited. Finally, the divorce question produced a whole crop of pieces, serious and comic; and it may be that the treatment of this question by a succession of dramatists, who dwelt on the misery and disgrace resulting from marriages practically dissolved, but legally indissoluble, had some effect in hastening the adoption of M. Naquet's Bill. The cruel position of a husband chained to a disreputable wife, and unable to set himself free, has been shown in one of M. Sardou's most effective pieces, which, thirty years ago, when England also was without a divorce law, would have been as effective in England as in France. But it was difficult for English audiences to realise the situation; and now that continued wedlock between husbands and wives who hate one another is no longer enforced by law, the difficulty for French audiences may soon be equally great. With the passing of M. Naquet's Divorce Bill such pieces as the *Odette* of M. Sardou, the *Diane de Lys* of M. Alexandre Dumas the younger, and the *Fiammina* of M. Mario Uchard lost all significance. When the pressure of the matrimonial knot has become quite unbearable it is now no longer necessary either that the wife should retire to a convent or that the husband should be shot. The difficulty is solved by the simpler, though less dramatic, means of a divorce. It is matter of publicity that immediately after M. Naquet's Bill became law the author of *La Fiammina* took precisely this view of his own matrimonial trouble.

There has been a recent instance, too, in Germany, of a subject of the day—this time a serious one—being dealt with by a dramatist. *Die Gräfin Lea*, a play by Herr Rudolf Lindau, contains a striking

exhibition of that prejudice against everything Jewish, to which in Germany the high-sounding name of anti-Semitism has been given. In a very ingenious succession of scenes he shows that the widow, who by reason not only of her Jewish faith, but also of her low origin, is deemed by her husband's relatives unworthy to succeed to his nobiliary estate, is an excellent and charming woman, who would not be out of place even in the very highest position. The tribunal before which the case is brought takes just this view of the matter, and the Countess Lea triumphs. But the dramatist's argument in favour of the Jews is somewhat weak; and he leaves us to suppose that if the Countess Lea had been an ill-bred, commonplace Jewess, instead of a Jewess of great refinement, the court might equitably have given judgment against her. A reply to Herr Lindau's piece, such as in France it would certainly have elicited, might easily have been written. But in Germany, as in England and all countries except France, the stage has not enough hold upon society to cause social questions to be often discussed in stage pieces. In France, on the other hand, the public takes such an interest in the theatre that the "boards" are almost to them what the platform is to the English and the Americans.

The production of a whole series of pieces on one particular subject of debate implies a continuous attention on the part of the intelligent public such as no stage but that of Paris—and the Paris stage only in modern times—seems ever to have enjoyed. Until the end of the last century the French dramatist was poorly paid, and as dramatist had little offered to him in the way of distinction beyond the hollow applause of the public. It was not until Beaumarchais obtained the decree fixing the remuneration to dramatic authors at so much per cent. on the gross receipts that writers of all kinds, and of every degree of eminence, began to occupy themselves with the stage; and it was not until all the best literary talent in the country had thus been attracted to the drama that the French Academy opened its doors to dramatists as such. Victor Hugo was a poet first and a dramatist afterwards. The elder Dumas was a dramatist first and a novelist afterwards—and he was never admitted to the Academy at all. The election of Scribe, a dramatist, and virtually nothing else, was quite an event. Since that time, however, the entry of a highly successful dramatist of long-established reputation into the Academy has come to be looked upon as a matter of course. The last dramatist elected as such was a very admirable farce writer, M. Labiche, author of *Un Chapeau de Paille d'Italie*, *Le Voyage de M. Perrichon*, *Les Petites Mains*, and other similar pieces, full of humour, but without the least academical pretensions.

. II. SUTHERLAND EDWARDS.

ROYALTY AND VICEROYALTY IN IRELAND.

I.—THE IRISH VICEROYALTY.

THE visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales to Ireland, and the holding of a levee and a drawing-room by Their Royal Highnesses in Dublin, effectually dispose of the last remnant of argument for the Irish Viceroyalty or Lord Lieutenantcy. For, absurd as it may appear, it has mainly been upon social grounds that the Viceroyalty has of late years been defended. Society in Dublin, it was argued, would suffer; trade with it, and Dublin would be reduced to a mere provincial town, if the Viceroyalty were abolished. Political considerations were ignored, but yet, politically, the Viceroyalty had long been a blunder of the hugest nature, what one would almost call a device of the enemy to prevent the realisation of the objects for which the union was carried. Partly, however, because it was a convenient means of carrying on the government of Ireland, partly because its abolition would have been opposed on purely local grounds, it has been continued to the present day, despite all the disastrous political consequences necessarily ensuing from the existence of a separate executive for Ireland. The institution is coeval with the English connection with Ireland. After the invasion of the country in the middle of the twelfth century and its nominal conquest, Henry II. determined on retaining it as an appanage of the English Crown. Unable, however, to govern it in person, his presence being required in England, he committed the administration of its affairs to a Deputy, or chief governor, or Viceroy.

Since that date dynasties have ruled and passed away, parties have changed, the relation of the two countries to one another has undergone the most extreme and vital alterations, but the separate form of government has survived all vicissitudes. During the three hundred and fifty years that followed the first wave of the Anglo-Norman invasion, the state of Ireland was one of constant strife and civil war. The Irish were unceasingly fighting amongst themselves and against the English. Deputy succeeded Deputy with varying success or failure, and English influence alternately waxed and waned. When the Tudors came to the throne the conquest of the country had still to be effected. The accomplishment of that task fell to the lot of the successive Deputies. They were charged with the conduct in person of the numerous campaigns that were undertaken; they were warriors rather than statesmen; and the office of Deputy thus came to possess that essentially military character which it retained during the reigns of the Tudor Sovereigns. It is very interesting to find in the State papers of those times laments which are as well grounded

now as they were then. First was the lament for the presence of the Sovereign. Passages could be quoted expressing the belief that many of the evils Ireland suffered under would be removed, or at least mitigated, if the Sovereign even occasionally visited that part of his dominions, and the belief was unquestionably sound.

Another thing complained of was the frequent change of Deputies, which prevented a definite policy being continued for any time. With the completion of the conquest of Ireland, and the accession of the Stuart dynasty, the military character of the office of Deputy almost ceased, and talents for organization and construction and administration were most in requisition. In James I.'s reign the Irish Parliament was vivified into life, and thenceforward the Deputy had the difficult task of managing a Parliament. He convoked Parliament, delivered the King's Speech, prorogued or dissolved Parliament, determined on the business to be submitted to it, and, in fact, acted generally the part of sovereign and prime minister rolled into one. The office was not in favour with the inhabitants of Ireland. The Deputy, or Viceroy, or, as somewhat later he came to be called, the Lord Lieutenant, had from the earliest period been identified in the public mind with the severe measures had recourse to in the conquest of Ireland. As the crushing penal laws against Roman Catholics were inscribed in the Statute Book, and as he was charged with their enforcement, and with the maintenance of the political and social ascendancy of a section of the Protestants of Ireland over the rest of the inhabitants of the country, he became a sort of religious persecutor in the eyes of the people, and their religious antipathies to him were added to their national ones. Now and then by chance some honourable high-minded nobleman filled the place, and blessed the country with as beneficent a rule as was possible under the circumstances, but too often, indeed generally, the name of the Lord Lieutenant was linked with measures odious to the people, and he was regarded as the embodiment of everything anti-Irish, anti-popular, and tyrannical.

Until some time after the middle of the eighteenth century the authority of the office was nearly absolute; but then the Irish Parliament became a power in the State, and the government of Ireland by the Viceroy was only carried on by crafty intrigues, by questionable devices, by undisguised bribery and corruption. He was surrounded by a pack of ravening place-hunters and would-be sinecurists, members of both branches of the Legislature; and as he had often to induce them to adopt legislation which they disliked, or professed to dislike, means were resorted to which scarcely bear the test of investigation. The Viceroy was, in fact, the centre round which a most vicious system of government revolved.

So long as Ireland possessed a separate Parliament, so long was the

existence of a Viceroy or Deputy of the Sovereign a necessity. But in 1800 the Union between Great Britain and Ireland was carried, and the Irish Parliament ceased to exist. It would have been natural, as well as fit and proper, that the executive government of Ireland should then have been resumed in its entirety by the Sovereign, and that the Irish Viceroyalty should have been abolished simultaneously with the Parliament. It was manifestly an incomplete union, which did not unite the governments, as well as the Parliaments. Every consideration of political finality in the great scheme of union pointed to making the measure as complete and final as possible; but, owing to the condition of Ireland at the time, the continuance of the Viceroyalty was deemed necessary. The country had just passed through the severe crisis of a desperate rebellion; English authority had for a long time hung doubtfully in the balance; the Irish Parliament as a system of government had proved a failure, and been extinguished; the embers of the rebellion were still smouldering and sputtering; emergencies were sure to arise requiring instant decision and vigorous action; communication with England was difficult, uncertain, and slow—for in those days there were neither steamboats nor railways—and it was requisite that some one having supreme authority, military as well as civil, should be on the spot, to deal with disturbances or other urgent matters as they arose. Therefore, though shorn of its real importance, and of its *raison d'être* as the medium of communication between the Sovereign and the Irish Parliament, the Irish Viceroyalty was continued.

The reasons for its abolition were cogent in the extreme, in fact incontrovertible, but the necessity for its continuance had temporarily to override the reasons. As years went by that necessity became less and less. When once the channel was bridged by steam, and distance annihilated by the electric telegraph, the necessity absolutely ceased; but, unfortunately, then the stupendous blunder of continuing the Viceroyalty was not recognised by British statesmen, and the results are only too apparent now.

Frequent attempts were made to convince Parliament that a separate government in Ireland was undesirable, but without success. In 1823, in 1830, and in 1844 the subject was brought forward by private members. In 1850 the mischief of the institution had become so patent that the Government was convinced, and Lord John Russell brought forward a Bill for the abolition of the office of Lord Lieutenant, and for the appointment of a fourth Secretary of State. The House of Commons was so satisfied that the Viceroyalty should be abolished, that the second reading of the Bill was carried by a majority of two hundred and twenty-five votes, only seventy members voting against it. The Bill was supported by Conservatives as well as by Whigs and Radicals, by Mr. Gladstone as well as

by Sir Robert Peel, but it was opposed by the bulk of the Irish National party.

Of the soundness of the general ground on which the proposed abolition was based there can be no dispute. The position of the Viceroy was unquestionably an anomalous one. He had the semblance but not the immunity of royal dignity, and the responsibility but not the freedom of action of a Minister of the Crown. The office, instead of being regarded with the respect paid to the Sovereign, as devoid of party, was treated as a distinctly party one, for the Viceroy was but the servant of the Cabinet. Over and above all, however, was the all-conclusive consideration that, the two countries being united, there ought to be a single administration. Whilst the measure was under discussion in the House of Commons, a debate on the subject was raised in the House of Lords by means of resolutions, and the abolition of the Viceroyalty met with the opposition of the Duke of Wellington. The grounds upon which he opposed it were, that, during the previous ten years, a continued series of military operations had been carried on in Ireland. The requisite operations, he said, had according to the constitution to be arranged by the military and chief civil authorities. If the Lord Lieutenantcy were abolished, the chief civil authorities would be the lord mayor or mayors; and as Mr. O'Connell, the leader of Irish agitation, had recently been Lord Mayor of Dublin, it would not be safe so to alter the constitution as to give him, or persons like him, a voice in any military arrangements for the suppression of popular disturbances. It would have been easy enough to have contrived means for meeting the objection thus raised by the Duke of Wellington, but the Government tamely submitted to the opposition, and Lord John Russell abandoned the Bill.

Since then no Government has renewed Lord John Russell's proposal; and yet, in the five-and-thirty years that have elapsed, the reasons for the maintenance of the Lord Lieutenantcy have been growing weaker, the arguments for its discontinuance stronger and more convincing. The importance of the office has steadily been diminishing; the patronage has sunk to the smallest proportions; political influence it has none. One by one, in fact, its honours and its privileges have been departing from it, and its duties becoming more circumscribed. Even specially it no longer fulfils its object. All the political disadvantages of having a separate executive government for Ireland, however, unfortunately remain in their full strength. First and foremost, the system of governing Ireland by a separate executive is a constant and visible expression of belief on the part of the Imperial Government that Ireland cannot yet be recognised as an integral part of the kingdom, and that a different form of government has permanently to be maintained for that country.

Then the existence of a Viceroy, and the government of Ireland in the name of a Viceroy, absolutely hides the Crown itself. The name of the Sovereign has principally been connected in Ireland with the most unpleasant of all associations, namely, prosecutions or judgments in the courts of law. The person of the Sovereign has seldom been seen in Ireland; and amongst a people imbued, perhaps, more than any other with the capacities for personal loyalty and devotion, no opportunity has been afforded for showing loyalty, none given for evoking and encouraging it. There is nothing round which the spirit of loyalty can gather. The circumstances which in England tend to evoke that personal loyalty to the throne and empire never have existed, nor do they now exist in Ireland; the upper classes have had the poor and ever-changing substitute for the Sovereign in the "mimetic institution" of a Viceroy; to the lower classes the English Sovereign has ever been but a name.

The Viceroyalty, moreover, is a visible and perpetual reminder of the stormy and miserable history of the past, which it would be well for all sides to let sink into oblivion as quickly as possible. But, most of all, it is a direct bar and impediment to the incorporation of the two countries into one. More than anything else, it is, in the fullest and direst degree, responsible for the slowness with which the great scheme of the union is approaching completion, and for the great variance of feeling at present between Great Britain and Ireland. By being the source of special or particular legislation for Ireland it has been a powerful factor in keeping the two countries apart, for nothing tends to keep countries apart so much as divergence of legislation. So long as the Irish Viceroyalty or separate executive government for Ireland is maintained, so long will the political union of the two countries be impracticable.

It is further to be remarked that the form of government existing in Ireland is absolutely unique, and altogether anomalous. Ireland is not incorporated with Great Britain, inasmuch as she has a separate executive government. She is not governed as a colony, for, though she has a governor as the colonies have, she has not separate legislatures as they have. She is not governed, as India or as a Crown colony, for, although she has a governor as they have, she sends representatives to the British Parliament, which they do not. In fact, she has neither the honour of forming an absolute part of the kingdom, nor has she the independence of a self-governing colony. On the very highest grounds of political principle, on the very broadest grounds of political expediency, the institution of the separate executive government of Ireland should be abolished.

Whilst so much can be said against the institution, no imaginable argument can be urged in its favour except a still-existing necessity. There remains therefore for consideration the question, "Is the Vice-

royalty still indispensable for the government of Ireland?" First, let us consider its duties, and whether for their discharge the Viceroyalty must be maintained; and, next, whether some other arrangement for their performance could not be made, which would not be open to the objections that exist against the Viceroyalty. It will enable one the better to realise what are the duties of the Lord Lieutenant, if one eliminates those departments of public affairs in which he has no authority. Some persons, even those who ought to know better, are under the impression that the Lord Lieutenant is at the head of all public departments in Ireland, and that every branch of the government of the country comes within his cognizance. This is very far from being the case. A large number of them are completely independent of him, and are under the control of the head departments in London; and it is a noticeable fact that there is less trouble about them, less friction in their working, and less agitation against them than against those under the Lord Lieutenant.

Thus the Post Office, with its branches spread all over the country, is part of the imperial department, and is under the Postmaster-General in London. The Lord Lieutenant has nothing whatever to say to it. Then there are the Customs and Inland Revenue departments, which are also under the head departments in London. With them the Lord Lieutenant has no concern. The authority in those matters falling within the province of the Board of Trade, is exercised in Ireland by the Board of Trade. The administration of the Factory Acts, and Gunpowder and Explosives Act is in the hands of the Home Secretary. The Valuation Office and the Board of Public Works are under the direct authority of the Treasury. The Irish Local Government Board and the Reformatory and Industrial Schools are under the authority of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. In fact, in many of the most important departments of the State—departments going a considerable way to make up the sum-total of government—the Lord Lieutenant has no authority whatever to interfere.

In what, then, has he authority? First must be mentioned the portion of his duties which are performed in conjunction with, or rather "by and with the advice of," the Privy Council of Ireland. This august body is a legacy also of the pre-Union period, but it is only the shadow of the Irish Council of previous days, no longer the home for factions, no longer the focus of intrigue, no longer a great factor in the ever-seething whirlpool of Irish politics. Its functions now are few and formal, and in the more important, such as proclamations under the Prevention of Crimes Act and Arms Act, it does little more than register the conclusions arrived at by the Lord Lieutenant, for in its relation to the Government it is an

executive rather than a deliberative body. Since the severance of Church and State in Ireland its duties have dwindled to those of the most insignificant character, and it mainly concerns itself now with cattle disease orders, bye-laws for the Irish fisheries, and the number of and salaries of attendants in lunatic asylums. Of late Parliament has shown a tendency to throw on it the duty of framing bye-laws, &c., under new Acts of Parliament; for instance, it has had additional work put upon it in connection with Irish tramways. Viewed as a whole, it is far from being that important body which some people in Ireland imagine it is, and it certainly has no duties which could not be otherwise performed. In England some of the analogous duties are performed by the English Privy Council, which might easily undertake Ireland as well; others by the Secretary of State for the Home Department. There is in fact no reason why the Irish Privy Council should be continued, and consequently, so far as the duties of the Viceroy are in conjunction with the Privy Council, they need not enter further into the consideration of the question.

The Lord Lieutenant is charged with a certain, but not very large, amount of patronage. Since the disestablishment of the Irish Church there is no ecclesiastical patronage; since the introduction of open competition there is little Civil Service patronage, a few heads or chiefships of departments and a few secretaryships alone remaining. The Lord Lieutenant nominally, but in reality the Sovereign on the advice of the Prime Minister, appoints the judges. In a similar way he appoints the lord lieutenants of counties in Ireland; he actually appoints county court judges, officers of the police and constabulary forces in Ireland, also the stipendiary magistrates, and in boroughs ordinary or unpaid magistrates. He also appoints, or, as it is called, "pricks," the high sheriffs of counties from the lists submitted to him by the judges of assizes. He has a few legal appointments, such as crown solicitors, clerks of the crown or peace, and also some unpaid and honorary appointments to certain public boards. There is, it will be observed, no patronage of a character different from patronage in England,¹ certainly none necessitating a Lord Lieutenant for its exercise. That portion which he exercises as deputy of the Crown should be resumed by the Crown; as regards the rest, other arrangements could easily be made.

The principal departments under the control and management of the Lord Lieutenant are the prisons department, the fisheries, the lunatic asylums, the registrar-general. Each and all of them are

(1) Perhaps I should except the appointments of assistant land commissioners, which rest with him; but these might with propriety be given to the Land Commissioners, who, as it is, appoint their valuers for quite as responsible work as the assistant commissioners perform.

analogous to the similar departments in England; and, so far as they are concerned, there is no necessity for the Viceroyalty. The Lord Lieutenant as the representative of the Government is also nominally concerned with the system of national education in the country, but as the exposition or defence in Parliament of the government policy falls upon the Chief Secretary, the latter is really the principal person. So far, then, nothing points to any necessity for the Irish Viceroyalty. There is one function or privilege of the Crown which has been delegated to the Viceroy, the exercise of which has of late subjected the Lord Lieutenant to much unjust contumely—the privilege of pardoning offenders or mitigating their sentences. In Great Britain the Secretary of State for the Home Department is the responsible adviser of the Crown in these matters, and as an illustration of the absurdity of any distinction in this respect between the two countries, it may be mentioned, that if an Irish convict is transferred to an English convict prison, as is frequently done, the power to pardon him ceases to rest with the Viceroy, and reverts to the Crown, acting through its Secretary of State in England.

The most important of the Viceroy's duties I have kept for the last, namely, the preservation of peace and order in Ireland. It is only too evident to any one who really knows anything about Ireland, that if the dead weight of the British Government were taken off Ireland, the two factions in it would be at each other's throats; and even now, between the frequent party demonstrations on the one hand, and agrarian crime and disturbance on the other, the Executive Government has to exercise vigilance and to act with energy. The whole of the Royal Irish constabulary force is directly under the control of the Lord Lieutenant, and also the Dublin metropolitan police force. Should these be insufficient he can always call on the military for aid. He has also at his control a large number (over seventy) of stipendiary magistrates, who are sent here and there, as occasion may require, to aid in the preservation of the peace. Furthermore, the Lord Lieutenant has usually had certain special powers given him by Parliament for the maintenance of law and order. The exercise of these powers rests with him exclusively, and he is responsible for their use. At the present moment he has extra powers under the Constabulary Acts, enabling him to quarter extra police in counties and charge part of their cost; under the Arms Act, enabling him to restrict the importation or possession or use of fire-arms; and under the Prevention of Crimes Act, enabling him to prohibit public meetings, and when needed to impose other restrictions on the liberty of the individual.

It is as regards this portion of his duties that the attempt will be made by some to argue that it is necessary to maintain the Viceroyalty, the more especially as the county authorities cannot be given

the control of the police as in England. I do not wish in any way to underrate the importance of these duties. I do, however, most strongly insist that they could be performed by means other than so anomalous an institution as the Viceroyalty. It may be doubted whether the Irish counties would be at all anxious to take over the charge of the Irish constabulary on the same terms as in Great Britain—namely, the payment of half the cost—for now, except where an extra force is required, they pay nothing. But at any rate we have in London a precedent of another sort, where the police force—numerically much about the same as the Irish constabulary—is under the control of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. There is no reason why similar duties in the two countries should be performed by a different authority, in the one by a Viceroy, in the other by a Secretary of State. Nor is there any valid reason why, if parts of Ireland have to be proclaimed under certain Acts, the proclamation should not emanate as proclamations do in Great Britain. Supposing, for the sake of illustration and argument, that certain counties in England were to become disturbed, and even ultimately to break out into rebellion, it would be preposterous to imagine that a Viceroy would be created specially to restore order. Existing authorities would be used. Yet what would be universally acknowledged as preposterous in the one case, is in actual operation in the other, and people do not recognise the incongruity.

One other phase of a Viceroy's duties remains to be noticed, namely, the social one. As the representative of the Sovereign he holds levees and drawing-rooms in the course of a short winter season, and entertains generously or parsimoniously, as his disposition prompts or his private purse admits. Dublin trade is supposed to be encouraged and increased by this outlay, and by the expenditure of persons coming to Dublin for the season and attending the Viceregal Court; and to a certain extent it is. The present Viceroy and some of his predecessors have been lavishly hospitable and splendid in their entertainments, but even so the Viceregal Court has lost its attractions. The country gentry or aristocracy who used to go to Dublin for the season have ceased to do so, and the great bulk of the people who attend the levees and drawing-rooms are the officers of the garrison, the official and the professional classes, or other residents in Dublin. Royalty itself might once more revive the popularity of Dublin; and give a real impetus to the trade there; and the holding of a royal court in Dublin by the Prince and Princess of Wales is an encouragement to hope that the experiment may be repeated, and that the abolition of the Viceroyalty need no longer be opposed on social grounds. Whether or not, however, the social grounds should no longer be permitted to weigh against the political ones.

There remains practically only the difficulty adduced by the Duke

of Wellington in 1850. It may be admitted that the contingency suggested by him might occur, but it could easily be provided against by giving the lord mayor or the mayor only a voice among the other magistrates, or, if that were not deemed a sufficient safeguard, by entrusting the stipendiary magistrate or magistrates of the district with the duty of conferring with the military authorities as to the arrangements necessary to be made for the preservation of the peace. It is difficult to find words sufficiently strong to stigmatise the folly which allowed this one easily surmountable difficulty to decide the question of the abolition of the Irish Viceroyalty in 1850—this one inconvenience to have weighed against the tremendous drawbacks and disadvantages entailed by its maintenance. It would be a repetition of such folly, aggravated by the fact of its being no longer a sin of ignorance, if any weight were again to be given to the Duke of Wellington's argument.

To the question, "Is the Viceroyalty indispensable for the government of Ireland?" an unqualified negative is manifestly the only true answer. But before giving unqualified assent to this conclusion, it may fairly be asked—"In what way is it proposed to provide for the performance of the duties of the Viceroyalty on its abolition?" There are two ways. One by creating a Secretary of State for Ireland; the other by assigning the bulk of the duties of the Viceroy to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and distributing the rest elsewhere. By the Bill introduced by Lord John Russell in 1850 it was proposed to create a fourth Secretary of State. The Crown was to resume those of its functions which it had delegated to the Viceroy, namely, its power of pardon, its patronage, &c.; but the other duties of the Viceroy, together with those of the Chief and Under Secretary, were to be transferred to the new Secretary of State. The scheme was not explained in debate as fully as it might have been. Sir Robert Peel was of opinion that the proposal did not go far enough, and that not alone should the Lord Lieutenancy be abolished, but the duties should be assigned to the Secretary of State for the Home Department. The Government appeared to look upon their own scheme rather as a step than as a final settlement, Sir George Grey being in favour of a separate Irish Secretary "in the first instance at least." Upon a careful consideration of all the circumstances of the case I think that this course would be the wisest,¹ and such of the duties of the Lord Lieutenant as are not resumed by the Crown, or as cannot at once be otherwise provided for, should be performed by an Irish Secretary. But the office should be created

(1) In the session of 1883 a Bill was introduced by the Irish National party for the abolition of the Viceroyalty, and the transference of the statutable duties to a Secretary of State, who should be an Irishman. It was, however, talked out on a Wednesday.

only for a certain number of years, and it should be an instruction to the new Secretary of State by Parliament that he should work towards the amalgamation of the Irish public departments with English public departments, and smooth the way for the ultimate surrender of his duties to the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

A Secretary of State could perform quite as effectually as a Lord Lieutenant all the duties which would be required of him, and it would be a distinct advantage to have in the House of Commons the person responsible for the government action in Ireland, and not merely the mouthpiece of another person. The office of the new Secretary of State should be in London. Places farther away than Ireland are governed from London. The telegraph has annihilated distance, and if time is of consequence, and instant instructions required, it would take no longer to telegraph from the country parts of Ireland to London than to telegraph to Dublin. Practically, real authority is in London, when, as often happens, the Chief Secretary is in the Cabinet and the Viceroy not. As a matter of fact, too, the real authority is where the House of Commons is, for no Viceroy can act independent of parliamentary considerations. Having regard to the facts I have stated, I think any unprejudiced inquirer must acknowledge that other provision could easily be made for the performance of the duties of the Lord Lieutenant, and that the Viceroyalty is not indispensable for the government of Ireland. If such is the case—and there can be no reasonable doubt it is—what single argument remains for the Viceroyalty?

I think absolutely none. The Irish National party have been of late directing the vehemence of their rhetoric against it. They hate it, because it has so often thwarted them in their plans and machinations. They hate it, because they look upon it as the pillar of English law and authority in Ireland, and they fondly delude themselves with the idea that if it were abolished the citadel of English rule in Ireland would have been carried, and the whole fabric of English government in Ireland would quickly be destroyed. But if it were abolished to-morrow they would find their error. English authority and English law in Ireland are not dependent on the Viceroyalty, and one of the disastrous consequences of the office is that people are led to think they are. English authority and English law will be every whit as vigorous, and not so assailable, when the powers now exercised by the Viceroy are held partly by the Crown itself and partly by a Minister in England.

It would indeed be a sorry policy to defend the Irish Viceroyalty solely because the Irish National party attack it. It is doomed to go sooner or later, for its existence is too great a political blunder to be allowed to remain. It is a prominent and an ever-present proof that, even in the primary matter of executive government, Ireland has not

been united to England. It is a perpetual reminder of the time when Anglo-Ireland had a Parliament of her own. It keeps alive and fosters the idea of an impossible Irish nationality, it obstructs similar legislative treatment of the two countries, and it defers indefinitely their union. It is a mark of dependence, the stamp or badge of inferiority. Are these results such as can be longer tolerated? I think not. I believe they have only been tolerated through ignorance, and I am confident that when the people of England awake to the evil results flowing from this system of government of Ireland, they will insist upon reform.

The present Viceroy, Lord Spencer, has filled the position under the most trying and difficult and perilous crises with a courage, a dignity, a firmness, and an impartiality, entitling him to the praise and admiration of his countrymen. But even in his hands—and it will never be in abler—the office is not redeemed from the objections I have urged against it, and the sooner this last remnant of the separate Parliament, the separate government of Ireland is swept away, the better.

HENRY JEPHSON.

II.—A NEW ERA FOR IRELAND.

THE study of Irish history from the Union to the present day must convince all but those who are wilfully blind that the policy of the several Ministries in power during that long period has been mistaken. An inspection of the statutes affecting Ireland passed since the Union, without even any reference to the events which have occurred in the meantime, must show that the Irish people have either justly or unjustly been subjected to laws made, not for the United Kingdom generally, but exceptionally for Ireland, laws specially repressive and coercive and absolutely incompatible with that freedom which is said to be secured by the British constitution. Many of the most severe of these laws have been enacted or re-enacted during the last sixteen years and are now in force, and this notwithstanding the remedial statutes of the same period, which, although admittedly in violation of those rights of property upon which the stability of society rests, were declared to carry messages of peace to the Irish people in furtherance of a Divine justice the execution of which was supposed to be expressly intrusted to their authors.¹ Half a century has passed since a profound thinker, afterwards a great Minister, always an able and a wise counsellor, thus expressed his sentiments in relation to the Ireland of 1836.²

“For the last seventy years Ireland has been the scene of constantly recurring disturbances; sometimes consisting only of the murder of a few persons, or the burning of a few houses, and sometimes rising to general insurrection. Successive Governments have apparently exhausted every means in their power to suppress the evil, but without success. The statute book has been loaded with the severest laws; the country has been covered with military and police; capital punishment has been unsparingly inflicted; Australia has been crowded with transported convicts, and all to no purpose; committees and commissions have collected piles of evidence; the most various plans of policy have been recommended by different persons; some have attributed the turbulence of the

(1) While considering the condition of Ireland in the past, it cannot be otherwise than useful to have a reference to some of these Statutes before us, more especially the following: Habeas Corpus Suspension, 1801, 41 Geo. III. c. 26; 1803-4, 43 Geo. III. c. 116; 1804-5, 44 Geo. III. c. 8; 1805-6, 45 Geo. III. c. 4; 1822, 3 Geo. IV. c. 2; 1848-9, 11 and 12 Vic. c. 35, 12 and 13 Vic. c. 2; 1866, 29 and 30 Vic. c. 1, 29 and 30 Vic. c. 119; 1867, 30 and 31 Vic. c. 1, 30 and 31 Vic. c. 25; 1868-9, 31 and 32 Vic. c. 7, till 25th March, 1869. 1807-1825, Insurrection Acts; 47 Geo. III. ses. 2 c. 13; 54 Geo. III. c. 180; 3 Geo. IV. c. 1, continued by 3 Geo. IV. c. 80; 4 Geo. IV. c. 58; 5 Geo. IV. c. 105 till 1st August, 1825. Whiteboy Amendment Act, 1 and 2 Will. IV. c. 44. 1833-1840, Coercion Acts, 3^d and 4 Will. IV. c. 4; 4 and 5 Will. IV. c. 38; 5 and 6 Will. IV. c. 48. 1848-1856, Crime and Outrage Acts, 11 and 12 Vic. c. 2 (1848), continued by subsequent acts till 1856. 1856-1870, Peace Preservation Acts, 19 and 20 Vic. c. 36, continued by subsequent acts till 1st July, 1870, and end of the then next session of Parliament. 1870, Peace Preservation Act, 33 Vic. c. 9. 1871-1873, Protection of Life and Property Act, 34 Vic. c. 25. 1873-1875, Peace Preservation Act, 36 and 37 Vic. c. 24. 1875-1880, Peace Preservation Act, 38 and 39 Vic. c. 14. 1881-1886, Peace Preservation Act, 44 Vic. c. 5; 1882-1885, Prevention of Crime Act, 48 and 49 Vic. c. 25, 12th July, 1885, and end of the then current session.

(2) *On Local Disturbances in Ireland*; by George Cornwall Lewis, pp. 1 and 2.

inferior Irish to their inherent barbarism, some to their religion, some to their hatred of England, some to their poverty, some to their want of education. Much new legislation has been tried, and in vain; in a large part of Ireland there is still less security of person and property than in any other part of Europe, except perhaps the wildest districts of Calabria or Greece; and there are persons who altogether despair of establishing a permanent tranquillity in Ireland and who think that it is an exception to all the ordinary rules of Government. Such reasoners sometimes even push their political fatalism so far as to conceive that there is an innate and indelible tendency in the Irish to disturbance and outrage; that Ireland has been cut off by nature from the rest of the civilized world and been foredoomed to a state of endless disorder; so desponding, indeed, is their language, that they almost seem to view the Irish people in the same light as Don Juan d'Aguila, the Spanish commander who, as we are told by Lord Bacon, after the battle of Kinsale, 'said in open treaty, that when the devil upon the mount did show Christ all the kingdoms of the earth and the glory of them, he did not doubt but the devil left out Ireland and kept it for himself.' At a time when many questions affecting the welfare of Ireland are under public discussion, and are likely soon to occupy a large portion of the attention of the legislature, it seems desirable that some attempt should be made to ascertain the true causes and nature of the disturbances in question; and to discover whether there is anything so extraordinary in the character of the poorer classes in Ireland as to bid defiance to the best established rules of legislation; or whether the appearances alluded to may not be explained without supposing any deviation from the general course of human nature."

It is clear from his writings, that Sir George Cornwall Lewis never believed that there was anything abnormal or desperate in the Irish people. He found reasons for their acts, a cause for their discontent, and so may we, if we will only apply our minds to the subject with intelligence and impartiality. The Irish as a race are kindly and generous. Wanting in none of the best qualities of mankind, they are intelligent, acute, vigorous, witty, and eloquent to a degree which all recognise who come in contact with them. They have in all parts of the world proved their fitness. They love justice, they resent oppression, they abhor tyranny, they are quick to appreciate kindness, equally quick to avenge injury. For years they have suffered and been poor and miserable, for years they have been subjected to laws said to have been necessary, to suppress their wild aspirations for freedom and to prevent them wreaking vengeance for what they believed to be unjust and tyrannical. What they might have been it is not for me to formulate; what they are, they have in a great degree been made by the circumstances of the country and the laws under which they have been compelled to exist. There is nothing in their nature which unfits them for progress and peace, under just laws and fair treatment. Since the lines quoted above were written by Sir George Cornwall Lewis, the Irish Church has been disestablished and the Irish tenant has been made free from the control of his landlord, or has rather been made practically co-owner with his landlord of his farm. Railways traverse the country, steamers frequent the Irish ports, laws for the relief of the destitute poor have been in operation, a system of national education has been successfully

established, municipal institutions have been reformed, the electoral franchise has been from time to time extended and is now conferred upon householders with the protection of the ballot, and the representation of Ireland in Parliament has continued unaffected. The representatives of the Irish people are more powerful than ever by their industry, their talents, and their perseverance. Yet, is the Ireland of to-day more free, more prosperous or happy than was the Ireland of 1836?

With such facts before us who can hesitate to conclude that the Irish policy of the British Government in the past has been a failure, and that if we seek for a brighter future there must be a great awakening, a new departure, a fresh policy by which the errors of the past shall be effaced and a happy and loyal people shall be established in what will become a new Ireland? Before indicating what this fresh policy shall be, let me call attention to certain facts the appreciation of which is a necessary preliminary to understanding its objects and probable effects. There are in Ireland about twelve thousand landlords and about six hundred thousand tenants. Until now (except in some few cases) there has been a perpetual warfare between these two classes tending naturally to alienate each from the other. The tenant has been led to regard the landlord as an usurper, who calls upon him for the rent of land which the tenant believes to be his by right. This belief cannot be affected by argument or even by proof to the contrary; the tenant holds it, and in dealing with him and the Irish question the sooner its existence is acknowledged and felt the better will be the capacity for decision and action. The Irish tenant looks upon the British Government, the laws which it maintains, the executive charged with the duty of enforcing those laws and the constabulary, the agents of this executive, as the instruments by which the rent of the land is extorted from him, and for this reason and to this extent, but no further, he detests the British Government. The Irish landlord feels that rights which he, not without reason, considered inviolable have been interfered with and that his property has been depreciated by the action of the British Government, for whom, therefore, he cannot be expected to entertain more than a lukewarm affection, or perhaps less than a decided hostility. But neither tenant nor landlord carries these feelings any further. To the English as a race, they are not hostile, but the contrary, while for the Sovereign and the Royal Family their loyalty and devotion continue unimpaired even by the strong feelings engendered by a sense of wrongs suffered at the hands of British Ministries. The Irish people not only cherish such feelings of loyalty and devotion, but desire frequent opportunities of expressing these sentiments. They will, we are certain, in spite of suffering and discouragement, at no distant day give proof of this assertion, when they welcome to Ireland the Heir-Apparent whose manly bearing, ready and eloquent

tongue and warm heart they know how to appreciate, while they will receive the Princess of Wales with all the chivalrous devotion of a Nation distinguished for its enthusiastic admiration of the virtues, the grace, and the beauty of woman.

The relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland are at this moment more strained than ever. The tenant, for the maintenance of his present rights and for their expansion, depends upon local leagues and societies, the contributions towards the support of which constitute a serious tax upon his resources. The landlord, for the assertion of such rights as have been left to him, for the collection of his rent, the protection of his property, even of his life, is forced to depend upon the Irish Constabulary, the maintenance of which cost the State in the financial year 1882-3 no less a sum than £1,530,144. Such a force as the Irish Constabulary would, but for the necessities of the landlords and the enforcement of their rights be, if not unnecessary, at all events much in excess of any possible requirements. Remove the disturbing element of agrarian discontent and the necessity for Coercion Acts disappears and a local police of moderate numbers and of a less military character, subject to local authority, would be amply sufficient for the repression of crime and the maintenance of order.

What, then, is the policy by means of which it is hoped to give birth to a new Ireland? The chief governor of the country must no longer be a political partisan. Some member of the Royal Family or some other distinguished and impartial person must be intrusted with the duties of viceroy. A Secretary of State for Ireland, with Cabinet rank, should be the political chief of the Irish Executive, being in fact the prime minister of the Lord Lieutenant, and holding towards him the position of the prime minister towards the Sovereign. Coercion Acts, Peace Preservation Acts, *et hoc genus omne*, must be repealed—would that they could be blotted out from the Statute Book. A local authority must be constituted in each county, or division of a county, of persons elected by electors having the parliamentary franchise, to whom shall be intrusted the fiscal duties of grand juries, the duties of boards of guardians, and the duties hereinafter referred to. The repression of crime and the maintenance of order in each locality must be intrusted to a local police, maintained out of local rates, and subject to the local authority constituted as already mentioned. The existing relations between landlords and tenants must be made to terminate as soon as may be, and this in the following manner :—

(a) The landlords to be obliged, as soon as may be, to sell all holdings, subject to the provisions with respect to judicial rent of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, forming part of their estates, to the local authorities, and such local authorities to be obliged, within a specified time, to purchase such holdings. (b) The price to be paid for each holding to be a fixed number of years' purchase of the rent at

which the same is held. (c) The amount of the purchase-money to be paid to the landlords or the parties entitled thereto, or into court as the case may be, in this manner:—One-third by the Treasury out of Imperial funds; two-thirds by the local authority out of moneys to be raised on the security of the rents of all holdings purchased by them and of the local rates leviable by them and to be collaterally secured by an Imperial guarantee.

(d) The tenants of the holdings so purchased to be obliged, after such purchase, to pay their rents to the local authority purchasing, who shall remit to each tenant one-third of the rent payable by him if the same be paid within a reasonable time (to be fixed by the local authority) after it becomes due.

(e) The rents received by the local authorities to be applied (i) in payment of the interest in respect of moneys borrowed by them, and (ii) in the formation of a sinking fund for paying off the moneys borrowed.¹

(f) The tenant to be at liberty at any time to pay off the whole or any part of the purchase money, and in the case of part payment to obtain a reduction of his rent corresponding to the amount of the purchase money paid off.

(g) An account to be kept by the local authority in relation to each holding purchased, showing the amount of moneys borrowed to pay for the purchase of the same, and of all moneys paid from time to time by the tenant of such holding by way of rent, or for redemption of rent, or on account of purchase money, separating the amount of such moneys applied to the payment of interest on the money borrowed to pay for such holding from the amount set apart for or added by the tenant to the sinking fund, for paying off the moneys so borrowed. When the amount of the moneys so paid by the tenant, and carried to such sinking fund shall be equal to the amount of the money so borrowed, or when such moneys have been paid off by means of the sinking fund, or by means of moneys paid voluntarily by the tenant, the holding to become the *absolute* property of the tenant.

To elucidate in a more definite shape these proposals for the purchase of holdings, let us assume, in approximate accordance with the facts, that the rental of all the holdings in Ireland would amount in round numbers to £10,000,000; if twenty-one years' purchase of the rent were the price fixed for the purchase of holdings, the total amount of the necessary purchase money would be £210,000,000, of this one-third, *i.e.* £70,000,000 is to be paid out of Imperial funds. Now, if the annual sum paid for the maintenance of the Irish Constabulary, say £1,500,000 were no longer necessary for that purpose, and if

(1) The rent which I will suppose reduced by reason of punctual payment to two-thirds of the whole rent would represent about $4\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. on the money borrowed by the local authority. If this money were borrowed at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the local authority would therefore out of the rent paid after providing for payment of the interest at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. have sufficient to set apart about $1\frac{1}{8}$ per cent. for a sinking fund.

sum, which represents the interest at 3 per cent. on £50,000,000, applied in payment of the interest on £50,000,000, part of the £10,000,000 so required, there would in respect of that £50,000,000 be no further charge on the British tax-payer.¹ The direct and immediate cost to the Imperial Exchequer of the great operation now recommended would, therefore, amount only to £20,000,000, a sum much less than was paid by way of compensation to slave-owners in the West Indies.

True it is the Imperial Exchequer would become, and remain for a considerable time, liable in respect of the guarantee given as collateral security for the repayment of the loans to the local authorities, but there is no reason why there should be any apprehension on this account, as the obligations of the Imperial Government under this guarantee only arise in the event of default being made by the local authorities in the payment of the moneys for which they are in the first instance directly liable, and such default would in practice be found to occur rarely, if ever. For while the local authorities are armed with the powers of raising, by means of a local rate, such moneys as may be required to make up any deficiency which may occur (by the default of their tenants) in the amount from time to time in their hands for meeting their engagements, and would be under an imperative legal obligation to exercise these powers in case of necessity; on the other hand, as these tenants will be the very persons from whom as rate-payers any such rate would be levied, it is self-evident that these tenants will prefer to prevent the necessity for such a levy accruing by the voluntary and punctual payment of the sums from time to time due by them; and, moreover, their neighbours and fellow rate-payers will have the strongest inducement to enforce, by that social pressure which is so powerful in Ireland, the prompt discharge of all these obligations. Individual liability will thus be guaranteed by collective responsibility and enforced by public opinion. Under these circumstances the ultimate liability of the Imperial Exchequer in respect of this guarantee is seen to be so theoretical and platonic as not to be a cause of alarm to the most nervous of British tax-payers.

Whatever may be the faults of such a policy, it possesses at least the element of novelty. Whether its adoption will alone suffice to secure to Ireland every blessing desired for her, or whether further measures may yet be required the future will show. This at least must be admitted, that as a condition precedent to any beneficial change in Ireland, agrarian discontent must be made to cease by some such legislation as I have indicated. Let these proposals be accepted, and laws made to give them effect, and I believe that in a

(1) There would, however, be a contribution payable out of Imperial funds to the maintenance of a local police which, if calculated on the basis of population and compared with the contribution paid to Scotland, would amount to about £180,000. The constabulary could be employed to garrison Irish towns and so replace an equal number of soldiers, who would thus be available for duty elsewhere.

p' few years' time the results will prove their efficacy. The representative of the Sovereign in Ireland, raised far above the arena of party strife, will have attached to himself and preserved for the Sovereign the respect and loyalty of the Irish people. There will be an end of agrarian discontent, Coercion Acts, Peace Preservation Acts, and all such exceptional laws, and their enforcement by the maintenance of a costly force of military police will no longer be necessary. Local self-government, founded upon a popular representation, will for the first time be established, and the discharge by the elected representatives of the people in their local assemblies of the duties imposed upon them, will require and develop that sense of responsibility which is the first and most important element of a healthy national life.

By a scheme such as I have indicated, the ultimate acquisition of the land by the tenants will be obtained without inflicting any injury upon the landlords, and with an expenditure which will impose upon Imperial funds a burden absolutely insignificant when compared with the magnitude of the objects in view and the beneficial results which must necessarily accrue to Ireland in particular and to the Empire at large from the attainment of these objects. While obtaining for the landlords an immediate payment fully equivalent in value to the proprietary rights which they now more or less precariously enjoy, the tenants will secure, in case of punctual payment, in the present a reduction by one-third of the sum which they now pay as rent, and in the future the certainty of becoming the absolute owners of their holdings. At the same time, the desire which the tenants will feel, and which they will be able to gratify, to anticipate by payments in advance the period of ultimate ownership, will assuredly supply an all-potent incentive to industry and prudence, which will go far to strengthen where it already exists, and to create where it is now wanting, a spirit of hopeful energy, of order-loving tranquillity, and widely diffused satisfaction, the surest foundation for the stable edifice of progress and peace which we look forward with confidence to see arise in our New Ireland.

One great difficulty, and the greatest we have to face, is to find a statesman sufficiently wise and courageous to undertake the work of which I have endeavoured to sketch the plan. But I do not despair. If such a man is to be found on either front bench he will have to forget the evil precedents which he has been taught to respect as authorities, and the official prejudices which have warped his judgment; he will have to acknowledge his errors in the past, to explain the reasons for his conversion, and to satisfy the country that his new faith is the outcome of a real conviction, and that with his new policy he sees the dawn of a brighter day for a New Ireland. If he can do this, he may rest assured that the Parliament and people of the United Kingdom will be with him.

R. O'HARA.

ORGANIC NATURE'S RIDDLE.

II.

A THOROUGHLY mechanical conception of nature is the scientific ideal of a very large and a very influential school of thinkers,¹ and the goal towards which they strive. In so striving they follow the lead of the earliest of modern philosophers, Descartes, who would probably have felt no small satisfaction could he have foreseen that the doctrine of animal automatism would be so eloquently advocated in the nineteenth century, as well as that of a mechanical evolution of new species of animals and plants.

Evidently the last-mentioned conception was necessary to render the mechanical theory complete. As long as men believed in the action of any mysterious intelligence hidden in nature, and working through it in specific evolution towards foreseen and intended ends, a mechanical conception of nature was obviously impossible. But no less impossible was the acceptance of such a mechanical hypothesis as long as any belief remained in the existence, in individual animals, of an innate and mysterious *instinctive* power directing their actions in ways beneficial to them or to their race, yet unintended and unforeseen by the creatures which performed those actions. A denial of the existence of any true "instinct," as well as of any unmechanical action in specific evolution, was then necessary for the maintenance of the mechanical theory, and accordingly such denials have been confidently made, as we have already seen.

While, however, this current of thought has been gaining in volume and velocity, another contrary current has no less made itself manifest, and amongst its exponents Edward Von Hartmann² is an eloquent advocate of the manifest action of intelligence in nature, and of what may thus be called an "intellectual" as opposed to a "mechanical" conception of the universe. He lays much stress upon instinct, and is as earnest in asserting its distinct existence and nature, as are the mechanicians in denying its existence.

(1) Thus Kirchoff has said (*Prorectoratsrede*, Heidelberg, 1866), "The highest object to which the natural sciences are constrained to aim is the reduction of all the phenomena of nature to mechanics," and Helmholtz has declared (*Popular Wissenschaftliche Vorträge*, 1880), "The aim of the natural sciences is to resolve themselves into mechanics." Wundt observes (*Lehrbuch der Physiologie des Menschen*), "The problem of physiology is a reduction of vital phenomena to general physical laws, and ultimately to the fundamental laws of mechanics;" while Haeckel tells us (*Prorektoratsrede und freie Lehre*) that "all natural phenomena without exception, from the motion of the celestial bodies to the growth of plants and the consciousness of men, are ultimately to be reduced to atomic mechanics."

(2) In his work on *The Unconscious*, a translation of, which has been lately published by Messrs. Trübner & Co.

As was said at the beginning of the former article, the great interest just now of the study of instinct, lies in its bearings on the Darwinian hypothesis, or rather on the philosophy therewith connected. Let us then proceed to examine whether or not the analogies before pointed out between instinct and other forms of vital activity can be carried further. Let us especially examine whether the consideration of instinct in the widest sense of that term, throws any glimmerings of light upon that most recondite and still most mysterious process, *the genesis of new species*.

We may be encouraged to hope that such a result is possible from the words of one of those twin biologists who on the same night put forth their independently-arrived-at views as to what we are all agreed to regard as at least an important factor in the origin of species. No less a person than Mr. Wallace has written the following significant words:—

“No thoughtful person can contemplate without amazement the phenomena presented by the development of animals. We see the most diverse forms—a mollusk, a frog, and a mammal—arising from apparently identical primitive cells, and progressing for a time by very similar initial changes, but thereafter each pursuing its highly complex and often circuitous course of development with unerring certainty, by means of laws and forces of which we are totally ignorant. It is surely a not improbable supposition that the unknown power which determines and regulates this marvellous process may also determine the initiation of these more important changes of structure, and those developments of new parts and organs which characterise the successive stages of the evolutions of animal forms.”

These words advocate and confirm what I have elsewhere antecedently urged. Many influences doubtless may come into play in the origin of new species; but let us look a little narrowly at certain influences which *must* come into play therein, and the action of which no man can deny.

One of these influences (which no one has more richly illustrated than has the late Mr. Darwin) is that of heredity; but what is heredity?

In the first place it is obviously a property, not of new individuals, not of offspring, but of parental forms. As every one knows, it is the innate tendency which each organism possesses to reproduce its like. If any living creature, *x*, was self-impregnating and the outcome of a long line of self-impregnating predecessors, all existing in the midst of one uniform and continuously unvarying environment, then *x* would produce offspring completely like itself. This fundamental biological law of reproduction may be compared with the physical first law of motion, according to which *any body in motion will continue to move on uniformly at the same rate and in the same direction until some other force or motion is impressed upon it*.

The fact that new individual organisms arise from both a paternal and a maternal influence, and from a line of ancestors every one of which had a similar bifold origin, modifies this first law of heredity only so far as to produce a more or less complex compound of hereditary reproductive tendencies in every individual, the effect of which must be analogous to that mechanical law of *the composition of forces* resulting in the production of a new creature resembling its immediate and more remote progenitors in varying degrees, according to (1) the amount of force springing from each ancestral strain, and (2) the compatibility or incompatibility¹ of the prevailing tendencies, resulting in an intensification, perpetuation, modification, or neutralisation of ancestral characters, as the case may be.

All such action is but "heredity" acting in one or other mode; but there is another and fundamentally different action which has to be considered, and that is the action of the environment upon nascent organisms—an action exercised either directly upon them, or indirectly upon them through its direct action upon their parents. That such actions produce unmistakable effects is notorious. It will be, I think, sufficient here to advert to such cases as the well-known brood-mare covered by a quagga, and the peculiar effects of a well-bred bitch being lined by a mongrel. These show how an action exercised upon the female parent (but with no direct action on the immediate offspring) may act indirectly upon her subsequent progeny.

As a rule, modifications accidentally or artificially induced in parents are not transmitted to their offspring, as is well shown by the need of the repetition of circumcision, and of pressure of Indian children's heads and Chinese girls' feet, in each generation. Yet there is good evidence that such changes are occasionally inherited. The epileptic offspring of injured guinea-pigs is a case often referred to. Hæckel speaks of a bull which had lost its tail by accident, and which begot entirely tailless calves. With respect to cats,² I am indebted to Mr. John Birkett for the knowledge of an instance in which a female with an injured tail produced some stump-tailed kittens in two litters.

There is evidence that certain variations are more apt to be inherited than others. Amongst those very apt to be inherited are skin affections, affections of the nervous system and of the generative organs, *e. g.* hypospadias and absence of the uterus. The last case is one especially interesting, because it can only be propagated indirectly.

Changes in the environment notoriously produce changes in certain cases, even in adults. The modifications which may result from the action of unusual agencies on the embryo have been well shown by M. G. Darwatz.³ As has been already remarked, processes of repair

(1) Mr. Darwatz tells us that two topknotted canaries produce bald offspring, due probably to some conflicting actions analogous to the interference of light.

(2) See *The Cat* (John Murray, 1881), p. 71.

(3) See *Archives de Zool. expér.* vol. ii. p. 414, vol. v. p. 174, vol. vi. p. 31; also *Ann. des Sci. Nat. 4 série, Zoologie*, vol. iii. p. 112, vol. xv. p. 1, vol. xvii. p. 243; and his

take place the more readily the younger the age of the subject. Similarly, it is probable that the action of the environment generally acts more promptly and intensely on the embryo than in the older young. 'That the same organism will sometimes assume very different forms has been observed by Professor Lankester in the case of *Bacterium rufescens*¹.

The effects of changed conditions is often very striking. *Ficus stipulata* grown on a wall has small, thin leaves, and clings to the surface like a large moss or a miniature ivy. Planted out, it forms a shrub, with large, coarse, leathery leaves.

Mr. Wallace has pointed out some of the curious direct effects of external conditions on organisms. He tells us² that in the small island of Amboina the butterflies (twelve species, of nine different genera) are larger than those of any of the more considerable islands about it, and that this is an effect probably due to some local influence. In Celebes a whole series of butterflies are not only of a larger size, but have the same peculiar form of wing. The Duke of York's Island seems, he tells us, to have a tendency to make birds and insects white, or at least pale, and the Philippines to develop metallic colours; while the Moluccas and New Guinea seem to favour blackness and redness in parrots and pigeons. Species of butterflies which in India are provided with a tail to the wing, begin to lose that appendage in the islands, and retain no trace of it on the borders of the Pacific. The *Aeneas* group of papilios never have tails in the equatorial region of the Amazon Valley, but gradually acquire tails, in many cases, as they range towards the northern and southern tropics. Mr. Gould says that birds are more highly coloured under a clear atmosphere than in islands or on coasts—a condition which also seems to affect insects, while it is notorious that many shore plants have fleshy leaves. We need but refer to the English oysters mentioned by Costa, which, when transported to the Mediterranean, grew rapidly like the true Mediterranean oyster, and to the twenty different kinds of American trees said by Mr. Meehan to differ in the same manner from their nearest American allies, as well as to the dogs, cats, and rabbits which have been proved to undergo modifications directly induced by climatic change. But still more strange and striking changes have been recorded as due to external conditions. Thus it is said³ that certain branchiopodous creatures of the crab and lobster class (certain crustacea) have been changed from the form characteristic of one genus (*Artemia salina*) into that of quite another

work *Recherches sur la production artificielle des Monstruosités ou essais de l'expérimentation*.

(1) See *Quarterly Journal of Microsc. Soc.*, New Series, (1873), vol. xiii. p. 403, and vol. xvi. (1876) p. 271.

(2) *Tropical Nature*, pp. 254-259.

(3) *Nature*, 1876, June 3, p. 133. Schmenkevitch at Odessa.

(*Branchipus*), by having been introduced in large numbers by accident into very salt water. The latter form is not only larger than the former, but has an additional abdominal segment and a differently formed tail. Such changes tell strongly in favour of the existence in creatures of positive, innate tendencies to change in definite directions under special conditions.

It is also obvious that the very same influences (*e.g.* amounts of light, heat, moisture, &c.) will produce different effects in different species, as also that the nature of some species is more stubborn and less prone to variation than that of others. Such, for example, is the case with the ass, the guinea-fowl, and the goose, as compared with the dog, the horse, the domestic fowl, and the pigeon. Thus both the amount and the kind of variability differ in different races, and such constitutional capacities or incapacities tend to be inherited by their derivative forms, and so every kind of animal must have its own inherent powers of modifiability or resistance, so that no organism or race of organisms *can* vary in an absolutely indefinite manner; and if so, then unlimited variability must be a thing absolutely impossible.

The foregoing considerations tend to show that every variation is a function¹ of "heredity" and "external influence"—*i.e.* is the result of the reaction of the special nature of each organism upon the stimuli of its environment.

In addition to the action of heredity and the action of the environment, there is also a peculiar kind of action due to an internal force which has brought about so many interesting cases of what is called "serial and lateral homology" which cannot be due to descent, but which demonstrate the existence of an intra-organic activity, the laws of which have yet to be investigated. Comparative anatomy, pathology, and teratology combine to point out the action of this internal force.

"Lateral homology" refers to the production of similar structures on either side of the body, as in the similarity of our right and left hands and feet. "Serial homology" refers to the production of similar structures one behind the other, as in the series of similar segments in the body of a worm or a centipede, and the similar series of limbs in the latter animal.

These tendencies to lateral and serial repetition show themselves in ways which cannot be accounted for by inheritance from ancestral forms, but loudly proclaim the presence and action of some internal forces tending to produce such homologous repetitions in organisms in different animals.

Thus even in ourselves, when we compare our leg and foot with our arm and hand, we find that they have homologous features which

(1) In the mathematical sense of the word.

cannot be accounted for as being inheritances from supposed ancestral animals. Our extremities resemble each other in the texture of the skin, the shape of the nails, and other points, and these resemblances are not due to external conditions, but exist in spite of them; and comparative anatomy reveals to us countless similar examples in the animal kingdom. Limbs can hardly be more unlike in form and position than are the arms and legs of birds, and yet we meet with breeds of fowls and pigeons the feet of which are furnished with what are called "boots," that is, with long feathers which grow on the side of the foot, serially corresponding with that of the hand, which grow the feathers of the wing.

Again, in disease, and in cases of monstrosity or congenital malformation, nothing is more common than to find precisely similarly diseased conditions, or similar abnormalities of structure, affecting serially or laterally homologous parts, such as corresponding parts of the two arms or two legs, or of the right (or left) arm and hand and leg and foot respectively.

Altogether it seems then to be undeniable that the characters and the variations of species¹ are due to the combined action of internal and external agencies acting in a direct, positive, and constructive manner.

It is obvious, however, that no character very prejudicial to a species could ever be established, owing to the perpetual action of all the destructive forces of nature, which destructive forces, considered as one whole, have been personified under the name "natural selection."

Its action, of course, is, and must be, destructive and negative. The evolution of a new species is as necessarily a process which is constructive and positive, and, as all must admit, is one due to those variations upon which natural selection acts. Variation, which thus lies at the origin of every new species, is (as we have seen) the reaction of the nature of the varying animal upon all the multitudinous agencies which environ it. Thus "the nature of the animal" must be taken as the cause, "the environment" being the stimulus which sets that cause in action, and "natural selection" the agency which restrains it within the bounds of physiological propriety.

We may compare the production of a new species to the production of a statue. We have (1) the marble material responding to the matter of the organism; (2) the intelligent active force of the sculptor, directing his arm, responding to the psychic nature of the organism, which reacts according to law as surely as in the case of reflex action in healing, or in any other vital action; (3) the various

(1) The existence of internal force must be allowed. We cannot conceive of a universe consisting of atoms acted on indeed by external forces, but having no internal power of response to such actions. Even in such conceptions as those of "physiological units" and "gemmules" we have (as the late Mr. G. H. Lewes remarked) given an explanation that very power the existence of which in larger organisms had itself to be explained.

conceptions of the artist, which stimulate him to model, responding to the environing agencies which evoke variation; and (4) the blows of the smiting chisel, corresponding to the action of natural selection. No one would call the mere blows of the chisel—apart from both the active force of the artist and the ideal conceptions which direct that force—the cause of the production of the statue. They are a cause—they help to produce it, and are absolutely necessary for its production. They are a *material* cause, but not the *primary* cause. This distinction runs through all spheres of activity. Thus the inadequacy of “natural selection” to explain the origin of species runs parallel with its inadequacy to explain the origin of instinct, as before pointed out.

The *formal* discoverer of a new fossil is the naturalist who first sees it with an instructed eye, appreciates and describes it, not the labourer who accidentally uncovers but ignores it, and who cannot be accounted to be any more than the spade he handles, other than a mere *material* cause of its discovery. So we must regard the sum of the destructive agencies of nature, as a material cause of the origin of new species, their formal cause being the reaction of the nature of their parent organisms upon the sum of the multitudinous influences of their environment. This kind of action of “the organism”—this formal cause—has been compared by Mr. Alfred Wallace, and by me, with the action of the organism in its embryonic development; and this, I have further urged, is to be likened to the processes of repair and reproduction of parts of the individual after injury, and this, again, to reflex action, and, finally, this last to instinct as manifested in ourselves and in other animals also.

The phenomena, then, exhibited in the various processes which have been passed in review—nutrition, growth, repair, reflex action, instinct, the evolution of the individual and of the species—will, I think, abundantly serve to convince him who carefully considers them, that a mechanical conception of nature is inadequate and untenable. For it cannot be denied that in all these various natural processes, performed by creatures devoid of self-conscious intellect, there is somehow and somewhere a latent rationality, by the imminent existence of which their various admirably calculated activities are alone explicable. We are compelled to admit that the merely animal and vegetal worlds which we regard as irrational, possess a certain rationality. This innate mysterious rationality blindly executes the most elaborately contrived actions in order to effect necessary or useful ends not consciously in view. We have here to consider the question, “How is this blind rationality, this practical but unconscious intelligence, explicable?”

Edward Von Hartmann, the eloquent prophet of the unconscious intelligence of nature, teaches us that such intelligence is the attribute of the very animals and plants themselves.

But can we limit the manifestations of intelligence and quasi-

instinctive purpose to the organic world? By no means. The phenomena of crystallisation, the repair in due form of the broken angle of a crystal, the inherent tendencies of chemical substances to combine in definite proportions, and other laws of the inorganic world, speak to us of unconscious intelligence and volition latent in it also.

A perception of this truth has led to the conception of the universal presence of true intelligence, as it were in a rudimentary form, throughout the whole material universe—the universal diffusion of what the late Professor Clifford called “mind-stuff” in every particle of matter.

Such a belief can, however, be entertained only by those who neglect to note the differences of objects presented to the senses, attending solely to their resemblances, and describing them by inadequate and misleading terms. The habit of perverting language in this manner, has been lately well spoken of as using intellectual false coin. By such an abuse of language and disregard of points of unlikeness, all diversities may easily be reduced to identity. Against such abuse the scientific biologist must energetically protest. The expression “life” refers to definite phenomena which are not found but in animals and plants. The crystal is not really alive, because it does not undergo the cycle of changes characteristic of life. It does not sustain itself by alimentation, reproduce its kind, and die. Anyone choosing to stretch terms may say that molecules of inorganic matter live, because molecules exist. But in that case we shall have to create a new term to denote what we now call life. We might as well say a lamp-post “feels” because we can make an impression on it, or that crystals “calculate” because of their geometrical proportions, or that oxygen “lusts” after that which it rusts. As the late Mr. G. H. Lewes has said: “We deny that a crystal has sensibility; we deny it on the ground that crystals exhibit no more signs of sensibility than plants exhibit signs of civilization, and we deny it on the ground that among the conditions of sensibility there are some positively known to us, and these are demonstrably absent from the crystal. We have full evidence that it is only special kinds of molecular change that exhibit the special signs called sentient; we have as good evidence that only special aggregations of molecules are vital, and that sensibility never appears except in a living organism, disappearing with the vital activities, as we know that banks and trades-unions are specifically human institutions.”

The considerations which are here applied to vital activity, may be paralleled by others applied to intelligence. They will show us that however profoundly rational may be that world which is commonly spoken of as irrational, yet that its rationality is not truly the attribute of the various animals which perform such admirably calculated actions, but truly belongs to what is the ultimate and common cause of them all, and to that only.

There is, indeed, a logic in mere “feeling,” there is a logic even in

insentient nature; but that logic is not the logic of the crystal nor of the brute; its true position must be sought elsewhere. It is *in* them, but it is not *of* them.

However, let us patiently consider a little this hypothesis of an innate, *unconscious* intelligence as the cause of the various strictly, or analogically, instinctive actions of animals.

It is in the first place plain that no intelligence could exist so as to adjust "means" to "ends," except by the aid of memory; and "memory" has therefore been freely attributed even to the lower animals. Let us see, then, what the term "memory" really denotes. Now we cannot be said to *remember* anything unless we are conscious that what is again made present to our mind has been present to our mind before. An image might recur to our imagination a hundred times, but if at each recurrence it was for us something altogether new and unconnected with the past, we could not be said to remember it. It would rather be an example of extreme "forgetfulness" than of "memory." In "memory," then, there are and must be two distinct elements. The first is the reproduction before the mind of what has been before the mind previously, and the second element is the recognition of what is so reproduced as being connected with the past.

There is yet a further distinction which may be drawn between acts of true recollection.

We are all aware that every now and then we direct our attention to try and recall something which we know we have for the moment forgotten, and which we instantly recognise when we have recalled it. But besides this voluntary memory we are sometimes startled by the flashing into consciousness of something we had forgotten, and which we were so far from trying to recollect that we were thinking of something entirely different.

There are, then, two kinds of true memory—one in which the will intervenes, and which may be spoken of as *recollection*, and the other in which it does not, and which may be termed *reminiscence*. Neither of these can exist in a creature destitute of true self-consciousness. There are, however, two other kinds of repeated action which take place even in ourselves, and which should be carefully distinguished.

The first of these are practically automatic actions, which are repeated unconsciously after having been learned, as in walking, reading, speaking, and often in playing some musical instrument. In a certain vague and improper sense we may be said—having learned how to do these things—to *recollect* how to do them; but unless the mind recognises the past in the present while performing them they are not instances of memory, but merely a form of habit in which consciousness may or may not intervene.

The second class of repeated actions just referred to are, on the other hand, those in which consciousness cannot be made to intervene, and are mere acts of organic habit. Thus a man wrecked on an island

inhabited by savages, and long dwelling there, may at first have the due action of his digestive organs impeded by the unwonted food on which he may have to live. After a little while, however, the evil diminishes, and in time his organism may have "learnt" how to correspond perfectly with the new conditions. Then with each fresh meal the alimentary canal and glands must practically "recognise" a return of the recently obtained experience, and repeat its freshly acquired power of healthy response thereto. Can "memory" be properly predicated of such actions of the alimentary glands? It can be so predicated only by a perversion of language. It is not memory, because not only is it divorced from consciousness as it occurs, but it cannot anyhow be made present to consciousness. Again, a boy at school has had a kick at football, which has left a deep scar on his leg. That boy, now become an old man, still bears the same scar, though all his tissues have been again and again transformed in the course of seventy years. Can the constant reproduction of the mark, in any reasonable sense, be said to be an act of, or due to, memory? Evidently it cannot, and neither can it be reasonably predicated of any of the actions of plants or of the lowest animals.

As, then, "memory" cannot be predicated, except by an abuse of language, of the lower forms of life, it would appear that neither intelligence nor rationality can truly exist in them, so as to preside over all those actions of nutrition, repair, reproduction, and instinct which we have examined and distinguished.

Nevertheless, Hartmann and his followers do not on this account hesitate to ascribe true intelligence to unconscious nature, and though such ascription may seem too absurd to deserve serious consideration, it would nevertheless be a great mistake to despise such opinions. For, as Mr. Lewes truly says,¹ "As there are many truths which cease to be appreciated because they are never disputed," so there are many errors which are best exposed by allowing them to run to a head. Mr. Butler, who carries this hypothesis of unconscious intelligence to its last consequences, asks,² "What is to know how to do a thing?" His answer is, "Surely, to do it." And he represents how, when many things have been perfectly learnt, they may be performed unconsciously. In a very amusing chapter on "Conscious and unconscious knowers," he says, "Whenever we find people knowing they know this or that . . . they do not yet know it perfectly." In another place he says,³ "We say of the chicken that it knows how to run about as soon as it is hatched . . . but had it no knowledge before it was hatched? It grew eyes, feathers, and bones; yet

(1) *Problems of Life and Mind*, ii. iii. iv. of Third Series, p. 85.

(2) *Life and Habit*, p. 55.

(3) *Unconscious Memory*, p. 30.

we say it knew nothing about all this. . . . What, then, does it know? Whatever it knows so well as to be unconscious of knowing it. Knowledge dwells on the confines of uncertainty. When we are very certain we do not know that we know. When we will very strongly, we do not know that we will."

Now the fact is that there is great ambiguity in the use of the word *know*. Just as before with the term *memory*, so also here, certain distinctions must be drawn if we would think coherently.

A. To "know," in the highest sense which we give to the word, is to be aware (by a reflex act) that we really have a certain given perception. It is a voluntary, intelligent, self-conscious act, parallel to that kind of memory which we before distinguished as "recollection."

B. We also say we "know" when we do not use a reflex act, but yet have a true perception—a perception accompanied by consciousness—as when we teach, and in most of our ordinary intellectual acts.

C. When we so "know" a thing that it can be done with perfect unconsciousness, we cannot be said to "know" it intellectually, although in doing that thing our nervous and motor mechanism acts (in response to sensational stimuli) as perfectly as, or more perfectly than, in our conscious activity. The "knowledge" which accompanies such "unconscious action" is improperly so called, except in so far as we may be able to direct our minds to its perception, and so render it worthy of the name—as we have seen we may direct attention to our unconscious reminiscences, and so make them conscious ones. In the same way then in which we have already distinguished such acts of memory (while unconscious) as *sensuous memory*, so we may distinguish such acts of apprehension (while unconscious) as *sensuous cognition*. By it we can understand, to a certain extent, what may be the "knowledge" or "*sensuous cognition*" of mere animals.

D. Besides the above three kinds of apprehensions, we may distinguish others which can be only very remotely, if at all, compared with knowledge, since they can never, by any effort, be brought within the sphere of consciousness. Such are the actions of our organism by which it responds to impressions in an orderly and appropriate but unfelt manner—the intimate actions of our visceral organs, which can be modified, within limits, according to the influence brought to bear on them, as we may see in the oarsman's hand, the blacksmith's arm, and the ballet-dancer's leg.

If such actions could be spoken of as in any sense apprehensive, they would have to be spoken of as "*organic cognitions*," but they may be best distinguished as "*organic response*" or "*organic correspondence*."

That the inorganic world, no less than the organic, is instinct with reason, and that we find in it objective conditions which correspond

with our subjective conceptions, is perfectly true; but when once the profound difference between mere organic habit and intellectual memory is apprehended, there will be little difficulty in recognising the yet greater difference between "organic correspondence" and the faithfulness of inorganic matter to the laws of its being.

That the *absence* of consciousness in actions which are perfectly performed, does not make such actions into acts of "perfect knowledge," is demonstrated by every calculating machine. No sane person can say that such a machine "possesses" knowledge, though it is true that it "exhibits" it. Similarly we must refuse to apply the terms "memory" and "intelligence" to the merely organic activity of animals and plants.

The assertion that in the vegetal and lowest animal forms of life there is an innate but unconscious intelligence, is an assertion which contains an inherent contradiction, and is therefore fundamentally irrational. Anyone who says that blind actions (in which no end is perceived or intended) are truly intelligent ones, abuses language. The meaning of words is due to convention, and anyone who calls such actions truly intelligent, divides himself from the rest of mankind by refusing to speak their language.

What experience have we which can justify such a conception as that of "unconscious intelligence?" We are indeed aware of a multitude of actions which are evidently the outcome of intelligence, but which (like the analogous action of a calculating machine) are performed by creatures really unconscious, though they may possess consciousness. But consciousness is the accompaniment of all those actions which we *know* to be intellectual and rational. Our experience then contradicts the hypothesis of the existence of any such thing as "unconscious intelligence." Such a thing is indeed no true concept, for it is incapable not only of being imagined but also of being really conceived of. It resembles such unmeaning expressions as "a square pentagon" or a "pitch-dark luminosity."

Nevertheless, our experience is *in favour* of the existence of an intelligence which can implant in and elicit from unconscious bodies activities which are intelligent in appearance and result. Thus we can construct calculating machines and train animals to perform many actions which have a delusive semblance of rationality.

"Truly intelligent action" we know as being intelligent and rational in its *foresight*, and therefore as necessarily conscious in the very principle of its being.

"Unconsciously intelligent action," improperly called "intelligent" or "wise," is that which is intelligent and wise only as to its results, and not in the innermost principle of the creature (whether living or mere machines) which perform such action. To speak technically, we have "formal" and "material" intelligence, as we have "formal"

and "material" vice and virtue.¹ We have already distinguished between the "formal" and the merely "material" discoverer of a new fossil, and this distinction is one which it is most important to bear in mind. It is the failure to apprehend this distinction which is the root of a vast number of modern philosophical errors, and the error which consists in asserting the reality of "unconscious intelligence" is one of them.

In fact "intelligence" exists very truly, in a certain sense, in the admirably directed actions blindly performed by living beings. It is not, however, "formally" in them, but exists formally in their ultimate cause. Nevertheless that intelligence is so implanted within them that it truly exists in them "materially" though it is not "formally" in them.

We have here, then, the answer to the question, "What is the rationality of the irrational?" It is a rationality which is very really, though not materially, present in the irrational world, while it is formally present in that world's cause and origin.

To every Theist this answer will be a satisfactory one. To him who is not a Theist there is no really satisfactory answer possible. This is a question not of theology but of pure reason antecedent to all theology. To reason, and to reason only, I appeal when I affirm that the existence of a constant, pervading, sustaining, directing, and all-controlling but unfathomable Intelligence which is not the intelligence of irrational creatures themselves, is the supreme truth which nature eloquently proclaims to him who with unprejudiced reason and loving sympathy will carefully consider her ways. He can hardly fail to discover, immanent in the material universe, "an action the results of which harmonize with man's reason; an action which is orderly, and disaccords with blind chance, or 'a fortuitous concurrence of atoms,' but which ever eludes his grasp, and which acts in modes different from those by which we should attempt to accomplish similar ends."² For myself, I am bound humbly to confess that the more I study nature the more I am convinced that in the action of this all-pervading but inscrutable and unimaginable intelligence, of which self-conscious human rationality is the utterly inadequate image, though the image attainable by us, is to be sought the sole possible explanation of the mysterious but undeniable presence in nature of a rationality in that which is in itself irrational.

ST. GEORGE MIVART.

(1) Thus a man wishing to aid another, but who by miscalculation causes his death, does an action which is "materially" homicidal, though "formally" his action is a virtuous one. Similarly a man may be "materially" a bigamist but not "formally," as when he has married a second wife being honestly convinced that his first wife was dead.

(2) *Lectures from Nature*, ch. xii. p. 374. John Murray, 1876.

SHAKESPEARE'S FUGUES.

WHATEVER value may be attached to the Hamlet critique in *Wilhelm Meister*, its significance is beyond question. It marks an epoch in Shakespearian criticism. It disclosed the secret of Shakespearian analysis. It showed that *Hamlet* was written upon one dominant thought, and the succeeding school, of which Meister himself—let us not say Goethe—was the founder, glancing with a “fine frenzy” down the vista of critical possibilities, took in hand all the dramas with the foregone conclusion of an underlying “metaphysical unity.” *Macbeth* was shown to be a “consistent theme upon ambition,” *All’s Well* a lay sermon upon “female persistency”—each of the dramas, in fact, a sort of peach whose sovereign interest for mankind lay in the morsel at the core.

Whatever strange discoveries this kind of criticism may have made in its wanderings, it began by taking one step towards the truth. It is not an “Open Sesame” to the secret of Shakespeare, but it suggests something which is more consistent if less ambitious. It touched, as it were in the dark, a characteristic that marks all the periods of Shakespeare’s dramatic life—that habit of playing upon one subject or several subjects in a drama, transposing the subject into different characters, and continually recurring to it with repetitions and variations, so that the drama presents something which resembles the continual recurrence of subject, answer, and counter-subject in a fugue. This is not identical with the “central idea.” Even in the case of *Macbeth*, it would be less correct to regard the drama as “a consistent theme upon ambition,” to draw attention from the main characters to this supposed central idea, which gives the drama its unity, than to leave out of account this metaphysical unity and observe the magnificent counterpoint that results from the combination of the subject in *Macbeth* himself, its transposition as answer a fifth higher in *Lady Macbeth*, and its recurrence as counter-subject in *Banquo*. Ambition will not explain the drama: it will not explain *Macbeth*, nor *Lady Macbeth*, nor *Banquo*. But it is repeated throughout the drama in different transpositions, just as a subject is transposed and repeated throughout a fugue. The German “central idea” will never explain the pose of *Twelfth Night*, nor guide us through the complex structure of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Where it does seem to hold, it is due to circumstances other than those suggested by the critic. Even the plausibility of *Wilhelm Meister’s* theory is due to the predominance in *Hamlet* of the single character, *Hamlet*. Similarly, if *Othello* is the hero of a

drama, and Othello is jealous of his wife, jealousy is bound to be the dominant if not the tonic note of the drama; and in such a drama as *All's Well*, where the interest centres in the heroine, if the heroine has a preponderant characteristic, that will be the preponderant tone throughout. Where the interest is not centered in the strength or the suffering of single characters, the German hypothesis fails and dribbles itself away into a Targum of second-sighted Rabbinism.

The name here given to this characteristic of much of Shakespeare's writing has the questionable advantage of not meaning too much. It is suggestive rather than explanatory. It does not imply that Shakespeare composed one of his dramas as Bach composed a fugue. But it metaphorically describes an undeniable characteristic of his work, a method which he adopts at the outset of his dramatic career in *The Comedy of Errors* and one that might be traced until he breaks his staff and drowns his book in *The Tempest*.

In *The Comedy of Errors* we observe the principle in its crudest form. The mistaken identity of the two brothers is a commonplace of classical comedy. But Shakespeare is not content with the twins Antipholus. He reduplicates the idea of twin brothers indistinguishable. He gives us also the two servants as like as two peas. And as if there were not enough of matrimonial disarrangement likely to arise from the wrong husband Antipholus, he makes Dromio of Syracuse also due to a woman that claims marriage of him, while he makes the master double-mistressed in the frank "Well met, Antipholus," of her who asks of him the gold chain which his other self promised. Still the work is crude and almost juvenile. The theme has no strength of tone. Its scope is only the laughter that crackles. Except for the little garden-fount of emotion in the Luciana scenes, it is unmoistened throughout. As for the structure of the composition, it is a mere case of multiplication by two twice over.

Between *The Comedy of Errors* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* there are stronger points of resemblance than the veritable conversion of Dromio of Syracuse into an ass because of a woman, in the person of Bottom the weaver. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is a *Comedy of Errors* in another world. It is built upon the same strange confusion of persons, but it is heralded by all the poetry of love and evolved under the influence of the fairies. Its prodigal imagination is, with all its fluency and freedom, curiously surrounded by a mechanism as artificial as anything in the early days of Shakespeare. Setting aside the group of fairies and the group of Athenian mechanics—who by the way counterbalance one another as a pair—all the other characters, except Egeus and Philostrate, fall in two and two as regularly as the ladies and gentlemen in a grand march. Theseus and Hippolyta drift on a stream of love that does

run smooth; Oberon and Titania, the fairy sovereigns, with their matrimonial disagreements, are set over against the mortal sovereigns; Lysander is made for Hermia, Demetrius for Helena; while the mock drama of Bottom and Flute has a mirror for them all in the love of Pyramus and Thisbe. Estrangement and false enamourment are played upon throughout. Oberon is estranged from Titania, and each accuses the other of unfaithful love; Oberon is blamed with Hippolyta, and retaliates upon Titania by flinging Theseus at her. Demetrius is in love with Lysander's lady, and Lysander becomes estranged from his own love and enamoured of her who is enamoured of Demetrius. Demetrius again is brought back from pursuit of a love that loves him not, to a sudden love of her who has been till now pursuing him, and who now turns away, and those who were formerly rivals for Hermia are transformed into rivals for Helena. The purple juice of the same "little western flower" that estranged the eyes of Lysander wrongly and of Demetrius rightly, makes Titania enamoured of the "sleek smooth head" and the "fair large ears" of her "gentle joy," Bottom. When each has got his own again, the hitherto unsmooth course of love, now quieted into reconciliation and gladness, is mirrored yet refracted with a half-satirical pathos in the dark glass of that "merry and tragical" scene of "young Pyramus and his love Thisbe."

These are two instances from Shakespeare's earlier work. It is at once apparent that the characteristic which has been compared to a fugue is here in great measure dependent upon the antithetical balance of structure in these dramas. Dr. Dowden, following a German critic, Hebler, has remarked the almost geometrical arrangement of parts adopted by Shakespeare before he has acquired the freedom of mastership in his art. This artificial disposition, so manifest in *Love's Labour*, in the *Two Gentlemen*, in *Romeo and Juliet*, and to some extent in all the earlier plays, disappears about the middle period of the dramatist. The characteristic hitherto spoken of is in the early dramas closely connected with their artificial grouping, but it does not disappear when the symmetrical mechanism disappears. It is prominent in *Twelfth Night*, a drama in which the stilted staywork of the earlier efforts is transformed into the easy equipoise of a perfectly healthy figure. In the great tragic period it is even more prominent than anywhere else. It might be interesting to consider how far it is an outcome of Shakespeare's earlier method of construction. Perhaps his body acquired a peculiar swing when he was using the stilts, and he has never got rid of it. Emphatically, it is a characteristic which he consciously retains and employs for artistic ends. Hebler has not taken notice of this other peculiarity of the dramas he treats of, dependent upon and perhaps springing out of the geometry which he has demonstrated. All the dramas he

discusses, moreover, are so-called comedies; he does not mention the tragedies. It is striking, too, that he does not include *Twelfth Night*. In that comedy we are relieved of the leg-about stiltedness which makes while it mars *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, yet he who runs may read therein the fugue upon woman's wooing. Viola woos the Duke, Olivia woos Cesario, Maria woos Sir Toby. In the comic parts of the drama there is a further illustration of the same kind of work in the fooling of Sir Andrew Aguecheek and Malvolio. To begin with the former, in the first scene where Sir Andrew appears he is manifestly a man born for ridicule; nature has so made him. Similarly, the first time Malvolio opens his mouth it is to utter wise foolishness and make himself a butt. They are two of nature's fools, both stuffed to the eyes with conceit; but the one is a simpleton without redemption, the other sophisticated beyond common sense. Sir Andrew, with his caper-cutting, has no shadow of dignity; Malvolio is altogether surrounded with airs of consequence. Thus the subject is differently set in the two parts: in Malvolio, so to speak, it is a fourth deeper, and something corresponding to fugal counterpoint is the result. The harmony is strengthened by both being brought to shame in the same cause—their courtship of Olivia, and by the same persons—Maria and Sir Toby; it is rendered more subtle by the one fool assisting in the ridiculing of the other. Whenever one or other reappears the subject is renewed. It is heard throughout the drinking scene, with the difference that Sir Andrew makes a fool of himself, Malvolio is fooled by the company. The same difference is preserved in the double *dénouement*, that acme of Shakespeare's comic genius. Sir Andrew only requires to be hustled forward; Malvolio must be lined; but both are utterly gulled. You follow the fugue through all the repetitions of the subject until you approach the finale. You expect the close, but immediately before the end and without warning the subject is taken up and repeated by another part with overpowering effect in the fooling of Sir Toby himself. The comic effect of this double gulling of two such wooers, heightened as it is by the unexpected recoil of Sir Toby's boomerang on his own head, yet mellowed and deprived of all cynicism by the hearty laugh of the good old knight, is unrivalled throughout the whole of Shakespeare.

The impression of the other subject made prominent in the drama is similarly emphasized by the fugal repetition of woman's wooing. The varied grace of the three women affords large scope for the most refined and subtle variations on the one theme.

"Orsino! I have heard my father name him;
He was a bachelor then,"

is the keynote of Viola, the artfully artless. There is a half-suggestion, in the mention of her father's name, that her girlish fancies

once before hung themselves round this duke on whose territory she is cast. "I'll serve this duke!" and with her naïve, brave modesty she dresses herself in boy's clothes and wins him before he knows it. The laughing shrew, Maria, plays off her cleverness against Sir Toby till she can bring him to her with a wag of her finger, and he surrenders himself to this "youngest wren of nine," this "most excellent devil of wit," as hearty a victim as ever yielded his neck for a woman to set her foot on. Olivia, unwilling and sorrow-dulled, first learns love from the lips of the persistent fair page, and courts him with favours and sweet-spoken liberties, as the lady of high degree one beneath her in station. Yet in none of the cases is the subject a simple repetition of Helena running after Demetrius in the *Midsummer Night*, or of the half-tragic passion and conquest of Queen Helena in *All's Well*. The Duke is not aware that a woman is wooing him. Olivia is not aware that she is wooing one of her own sex. Maria rather flirts the heart out of Sir Toby's breast than woos it. And there is none of the rude aversion on the man's part that we find in the case of Demetrius and of Bertram. The Duke is fond of his page-wooer. Viola, with her quaint "I am the man," is half humoured with her pathological-ludicrous situation. Sir Toby simply lets himself go, and relishes it immensely. But the Duke does none of the wooing until he is won; nor does Cesario in his odd predicament run away, though he does not mean to let the thing go too far; nor does Sir Toby make advances and figure as a lover. It is a fugue for female voices. Our ear is arrested not more by the piquancy of the simple theme, as it is transposed from the sweet mezzo-soprano of Viola to suit Maria's shrill treble and the strong and tender alto of Olivia, than it is by the subtle and strange surprise of the transitions and variations;—the seeming boyhood that covers Viola's maiden blush before the Duke reappearing as the "youth's perfections" that creep "with an invisible and subtle stealth" in Olivia's eyes. Girl Viola in love with the Duke, the Duke with Olivia, Olivia with boy Viola; boy Viola with "barful strife" acting as love's messenger from him for whom girl Viola pines in thought, to her who is her unconscious and unwilling rival; wooing a wife for him whose wife she herself would be; wooing her own rival, and to her dismay winning not for her master but for herself; while Olivia, beginning by loving one than whom, "poor lady, she were better love a dream," is brought by nature's bias to a "most happy wreck," and having wooed both a maid and a man, ends in wedding herself to the right sex by mistake. Maria's part is made elaborate by none of those involutions and complexities; she simply opens her full battery of woman's wit and carries Sir Toby by storm.

We see the same heightening of effect here as we saw in the more

comic parts of the drama, and as we shall see presently in the tragedies. In the tragedies the fugal device is employed in a somewhat different way, but the difference may be considered due to the difference between the two forms of dramatic art. Comedy demands incident, tragedy demands passion; the fugues in Shakespeare's earlier work are fugues of circumstance, those in his tragic work are of the soul. But just as Shakespeare never gives us mere incident without the human interest, so the refraction which flings a prismatic brilliance over his comedies is never a mere refraction of unspiritual circumstance, but has always a full blending of the hues of character; and just so is there a counterpart blending of circumstance when he reveals the lightnings of the life-storm, and the souls of men ground out of shape by the destiny that makes life tragic. Still the difference holds. The fugal subject in *The Midsummer Night* was false enamourment; in *Othello* it is jealousy. There is not a chalk-line of distinction, that in the former we have an event and in the latter a passion, for the passion is entangled in the web of circumstance, and the event is suffused with light from the soul. But we see the difference if we place side by side Titania fondling the long ears of Bottom, and Othello demanding the strawberry handkerchief while his wife pleads for Cassio. The difference is just the difference between comedy and tragedy; between the sunshine of life and the shadow of death; between the finite that surrounds us and the infinite that is within us.

The "growth of Shakespeare's mind and art" is faithfully reflected in his employment of this device. We saw how crudely it began in *The Comedy of Errors*, how it was refined and rendered more intricate in *The Midsummer Night's Dream*, how it was perfected for all the purposes of comedy in the subtle changes and contrasts and the complex harmonies of *Twelfth Night*. We shall now see how, in the lurid passage of his life that follows, he employs the same device to intensify the pity and the terror, while he lets us hear the tread of destiny and the cry of broken lives.

Hamlet is a tale of worldling and idealist, of hearts grown rotten and souls driven mad, enveloped in the shadow of suicide, and overhung by the wraith from the other world. Madness is one of the themes. We are prepared for it by the utter weariness of the first soliloquy, sinking into the dull despair of its closing phrase—

"Break, my heart, for I must hold my tongue."

A new note, loud and thrilling, is struck in the next words of Hamlet alone, "My father's spirit in arms!" and then we hear, not the theme itself, as we had anticipated, but a weird transposition of it, ringing out in the anguish of those half-delirious moments when Hamlet's soul seems just on the hither brink:—

"O all you host of heaven! O earth! What else?
And shall I couple hell?"

O most pernicious woman!

O villain, villain, smiling, damned villain!

My tablets! meet it is I set it down

That one may smile, and smile, and be a villain:

At least, I'm sure it may be so in Denmark."

Again we hear a transposition of the theme in the slight preluding manner of Hamlet's "antic disposition"—madness arranged in a falsetto. We follow the subtle and shifting fugue, from the tragic "Ah, ha, boy! art thou there, truepenny?" "Well said, old mole!" to the half comic "Excellent well; you are a fishmonger;" and back again from the feigned inanity of "As by lot, God wot," "It came to pass, as most like it was," once more to the perils of the tottering verge. We follow the intricacies and involutions of this curious *ricercata* through the scene where Hamlet greets Ophelia at her orisons, through his galvanic excitement at the play within the play, through his foiling and fooling of the courtiers, through the closet scene with his mother, until at last all intricacy and involution are set aside, and we descend upon the bare theme, unadorned, unconcealed, piercing with its simple wail, in "Bonny sweet Robin is all my joy."

We have here, then, a fugue upon madness, in which the piteous case of Ophelia is blended and contrasted with Hamlet's transformation; and this latter is again broken up into two parts—the falsetto in which Hamlet appears "far gone, far gone," and the sharp cry that breaks from him when his real malady is burning into his brain. But there are other subjects in the drama treated in the same way. Polonius first tempts his daughter's trustfulness and truth with his diabolic wisdom and his low suspicions. He backs up his "few precepts" by giving Reynaldo a lesson in lying, and directions to play the spy upon his son's behaviour. In the next scene the king and queen, in more politic phrase, give a similar commission to Rosenorantz and Guildenstern to play the spy upon their son. Polonius crowns himself in the intrigue by which he gets his simple child to join the espionage upon her lover. Hamlet is spied upon at every hand—alone, with his mother, with Ophelia; and he encounters the spies with a subtlety outnatching theirs. Claudius is untrue to his brother, the queen to her late lord's memory, Ophelia to her lover, Rosenorantz and Guildenstern to their college friend; and the opposite side of the same idea is variously expressed in the tragic constancy of Hamlet to the ghost's mission, in the pretentious bluster of Laertes' mock-heroical loyalty to his dead father and sister, and the quiet and steadfast fidelity of Horatio. The treachery of the "cursed hebenon" is twice repeated in Hamlet's letters to England, and twice

again in the poisoning of the wine and of the rapier in the last scene. Espionage, unfaithfulness, and treachery are taken up in different parts, repeated, varied, and interwoven, both in the characters and in the situations, until they haunt the listener like a mocking laugh, and he feels their evil presence touching him in the atmosphere.

Of *Macbeth* I have already said a word. The leading theme is taken up in its full hard strength by the leading character, and yet discoursed withal in such a manner that its strains have a sublime poetry in them. In Lady Macbeth it reaches a feminine shrillness, vehemence, ferocity. Macbeth thinks of the "golden opinions" he has won, of "the be-all and the end-all," of his double trust of hospitality and kinship, of "pity, like a naked, new-born babe striding the blast"—all putting curb upon his "vaulting ambition." Lady Macbeth, unsexed and inhuman, applies the goad with a merciless fury that makes the blood curdle. The subject is renewed with again a different tone in Banquo—casier, even, colder—reminding us of one who sings his part correctly, without a gleam of genius. His ambition falls upon our ears like a soulless echo, a voice robbed of its passion, coming from rocks in the distance, and bringing with it a restful suspense. We listen to the genuine sound, the full-throated and unmistakable directness of utterance in—

"To be thus is nothing; but to be safely thus!"

And again repeated with the same clear intensity, but this time piteously softened, like the woman's heart from which it breaks:—

"Nought's had, all's spent."

Of a part with this cunning harmony are the haunting refrains that come up from time to time throughout the piece. The scream of the owl may seem to sound through the livelong night that overshadows more than half this drama, but we hear the funereal burden upon sleep, and it is supported by another burden of even more sombre effect in the hard staccato upon the "drops of blood." Macbeth's "dagger of the mind," with the gout of blood upon its blade, awakens a phrase that comes up again when he looks at his hands after the deed, and asks himself—

"Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
Clean from my hand?"

It returns upon us at other times throughout the drama, until we hear it finally in the remorseful terrors of the sleep-walking scene.

This voice in sleep has also the dying cadence of that refrain first chanted by Macbeth in his half-distraught, half-inspired moments when the murder is just done:—

"Sleep no more,
Macbeth shall sleep no more . . .
Glamis hath murdered sleep; and therefore Cawdor
Shall sleep no more; Macbeth shall sleep no more."

This is "the curtained sleep," "the downy sleep, death's counterfeit;" but the reality is abused by no wicked dreams.

"Duncan is in his grave;

After life's fitful fever he sleeps well."

It is "the innocent sleep" that we first see looked on by the red eyes of murder, and last, more terribly tragically than in Duncan's grave, lying slain on the glassy glitter of the guilty queen's sense-closed open eyes.

Macbeth, though not quite so simple that "he who runs may read," is nevertheless the most direct and least complicated of Shakespeare's great works; and there is no other in which one theme of the like simple force is so firmly accentuated throughout, and is withal so powerful in its unvaried repetition. There is embellishment, but the embellishment never conceals the hard theme. Yet the theme, as we hear it, derives its power from the characters who support it. We do not listen to ambition; we listen to Macbeth and Lady Macbeth.

Similar in some respects is the position in *Othello* of the passion upon which the *dénouement* there depends. Jealousy, indeed, does not explain the drama, for we have in it also the tragedy of her whose loyal young heart breaks through old ties to follow the instinct of her love, and who suffers and dies as Juliet suffered and died. It is Desdemona's tragedy in as full measure as it is *Othello's*. Still jealousy makes the tragedy; Iago will be satisfied if, in his easy, improvising way, he can strike the chord of *Othello's* jealousy. A passion the very nature of which is to entangle itself round a number of victims, readily lends itself to such a device as that which we have been considering. *Othello* is made jealous; he is jealous of his wife, and he is jealous of her with Cassio. It is in the nature of the passion that there should here be three victims. But the passion reflects itself. Roderigo, too, is jealous; Iago is jealous; Bianca is jealous for one moment; Emilia begins to be filled with that suspicion which is but jealousy in other form. On a subject so apparently suited for fugual elaboration we might expect to find a composition intricate and complex, with a highly developed harmony of parts. We do not find this. We find the subject filtering into other parts besides the principal, but jealousy in the drama is almost a solo. In the others it is merely incidental; in *Othello* alone does it become a passion penetrating and absorbing his whole nature. There is a prelude in the first act: faint sounds of the theme are heard when Iago is playing upon the simple instrument, Roderigo; and one of the final notes of the Moor's jealousy is struck in Brabantio's mistrust:—

"Look to her, Moor, if thou hast eyes to see;
She has deceived her father, and may thee."

Almost parallel to the "drops of blood" in *Macbeth*, but with the

significance of a cause instead of an effect, is the three-fold repetition of the scene with the strawberry handkerchief. It does triple work—with Othello, with Bianca, and with Emilia. Othello would say, "Thou hast given it to some man!" Bianca says—

"O Cassio, whence came this?"

This is some token from a newer friend."

Emilia first asks—

"What will you do with 't, that you've been so earnest
To have me filch it?"

and at last, learning her husband's villainy—

"May his pernicious soul

Rot half a grain a day! . . .

O thou dull Moor! that handkerchief thou speak'st of
I found by fortune and did give my husband."

Similarly Cassio, suing Desdemona to make intercession for him, does, in deeper sense than Desdemona thinks, "leave part of his grief with her to share with him."

"Hurt? ay, past all surgery. I have lost the immortal part of myself and what remains is bestial. My reputation, Iago, my reputation!"

Pitiful and guileless, Desdemona takes up his cry, and pleading for him who has lost his reputation, she pleads away her own. Emilia is blamed, as Desdemona is blamed; and Cassio, innocent with Desdemona, is guilty with Bianca. There is further a peculiarly refined instance of this same characteristic of Shakespeare's work in the likeness and unlikeness of Desdemona and Bianca—both insulted for the same guilt, Cassio's kisses on their lips; the innocence of the longtime friend that can recall the wooing days when Cassio bore love messages for her refracted in the passion of the mistress whose word is—

"And I was going to your lodging, Cassio.

What, keep a week away? seven days and nights?

Eight score eight hours? and lovers' absent hours,

More tedious than the dial eight score times!"

While the faithfulness of the ideal wife, who is true even in her "immortal falsehoods," reflects itself in the wifely fidelity and tenderness of her whose cry utters the whole heart of womanhood:—

"O Cassio, my dear Cassio—

Alas! he faints: O Cassio, Cassio, Cassio!"

Lear is a drama wherein we see the ties of nature broken by nature's self; wives that have chosen them husbands and go down as rivals into the stews of lust after another; daughters in whose mouths the words of filial love breathe corruption; a son who claims nature as his goddess, and reveals nature working in his heart like a cancer. The feature hitherto spoken of is more characteristic of this than of any other tragedy of the four. *Lear's* case is repeated in Gloucester's. The two old men, like one another in their divided

offspring, and united by the bond of nature's cruelty, are further linked together by the manner of their suffering and of their passing away. Both are brought to the doors of madness; Lear enters. They die, each embracing the child he has wronged. Lear's last words, with his, "Pray you, undo this button; thank you, sir," bring up before us Gloucester's end, when—

"his flawed heart
Twixt two extremes of passion, joy and grief,
Burst smilingly."

So Goneril and Regan reappear in Edmund, Cordelia is found again in Edgar. Filial ingratitude and filial fidelity are refracted from Lear's children to Gloucester's, and in either case the true heart is smitten and driven away, while the false establishes itself, and by its success brings round the retribution.

But the illustration of this fugal play is not confined to the palpable parallel between Lear and his children and Gloucester and his children. There is more than an elaborate parallel; there is the same subtlety of changes in the detail, and the same daring intricacies of harmony already noticed as characteristic of *Twelfth Night* and of *Hamlet*. Edgar, driven from his father's mistaken anger, is not a mere counterpart of Cordelia, more than Edmund is of the two dragonesses. The counterpart of Edgar's disownment is the curse upon Cordelia, but it is also Kent's banishment; and the loyalty which brings back Kent to follow and guard his old master under disguise is a mutation of the same loyalty that makes Edgar an unknown guide and guardian to his blinded father. Edgar, too, first joins the company of Lear upon the heath, and furnishes the fourth of a strange quartette—Lear, once folly in the guise of wisdom, and now realising wisdom as he approaches madness; the Fool, always wisdom in motley; Edgar himself, whose words have neither wisdom nor pretence of it, but whose pretended madness repeats with a difference the real malady of Lear; and Kent, who is Lear's first voice of warning come back to him, whose disguise repeats the disguise of Edgar, and whose fidelity repeats in other tone the fidelity of the Fool.

There is a flaw in *Lear*. In this tragedy, as in no other of Shakespeare, have we *characters* tending to lose the vivid and individual emphasis of their personality in *characteristics*. The twist of nature in the two daughters and in Edmund is so abnormal, and their ingratitude strikes us with such a dead chill, that their persons half melt from their individual limning, while their ingratitude starts out with almost the circumstantial force of a personality. There are touches which redeem these beings to a humanity that is past redemption, which, while they are the last strokes added to confirm them as utterly lost, at the same time assure us that these creatures

certainly lived, though never others lived like them; still we seem at times to be moving in a world where evil influences have but assumed a human form. The fault is partly due to this very practice of Shakespeare's, of producing an emphasized impression by ringing the changes upon single concepts. In all the other dramas we have noticed, the device has been completely successful; here it is only not a failure.

Glancing again at these four tragedies, we observe that while each of the four impresses us differently from the others, and while each of the four has large diversity within itself, yet the total impression of each is not only of a unity amid diversity, but of a unity towards which this diversity converges, an impression of unity which this very diversity helps to produce. Shakespeare's tragedies are something more than studies upon the deep things of life and love and death; they are works of art, and as works of art they have and are intended to have an æsthetic value. Each of these four might almost be said to have its own ground colour. In *Hamlet* the ghastly moonlight and the ashen hues of the ghost suffuse the whole play; *Macbeth* is reddened throughout with the flare of the witches' caldron-fire. Be that as it may, the diversity in *Hamlet*, for example, is as sympathetically as it is instinctively selected with a view to the whole, and the impression left is of an artistic harmony. The ghost, Ophelia and Polonius, the players, the gravediggers and Yorick, Laertes and Horatio, combined with the artist's infallible touch, are all in place here as they would be nowhere else. Yorick would have marred *Lear* as much as the Fool would have marred *Hamlet*. The ghost and the witches have each the only place they can occupy.

Now the device of which I have been speaking plays a double part with regard to this artistic effect: on the one hand it helps to produce the impression of unity, and on the other it deepens the æsthetic impression. So far from assisting the artist towards a more life-like delineation, the device, if employed by hands unsure of large mastery, or unskilled in the stroke, would altogether mar the work by presenting us mere ineffective duplicates or tedious repetitions. It is not a device that one of our modern playwrights could use with impunity; but Shakespeare, who deals neither in types nor in portraits, but in creations, can utilise a single idea with all the variety of nature, and without falling into a vapid monotony can employ this single idea so as to impart an artistic unity and produce a thrice-emphasized artistic impression. Not only is the device similar to the method employed in the elaboration of a fugue, but its impression is exactly the impression which a fugue leaves.

JOHN G. DOW.

THE TRANSFER OF LAND.

IN every country the theory of the land laws has depended on the fact that land was never intended to be dealt with by free commerce and barter, and its sale and exchange have in all times been surrounded with legal difficulties of every description. Lord Cairns' Act of 1880 deals a death-blow at this doctrine, and recognises once for all the importance of rendering land negotiable in the hands of limited owners. It requires but one step more to free the land from the grip of the law and to render it as negotiable as other forms of wealth. In order clearly to understand the structure of land laws it is necessary to consider the structure of the society whose affairs are regulated by these laws; I must, therefore, say something upon that mysterious portion of our polity, the institution of the legal profession, its influence on the evolution of the laws, and its modern bearings on the future of legal enactments.

Besides the widely recognised influence of the laws of property in conserving and strengthening the foundations of English society, no influence has been, or is likely to be, so strongly Conservative as the legal profession. It is and has always been directly interested in maintaining intact—formerly against powerful monarchs, and of later times against a still more powerful democracy—the sacred precedents (1) of the old common law, and (2) of the intricate chicaneries of feudal enactment and conveyance. The ingenuity with which in former centuries the lawyers turned the edge of successive Acts of Parliament dealing with the laws of real property, is well known to every student of law and history. The lawyer was always supreme in the councils of the family, and at every great epoch of existence—the marriage, the death, the attainder of the owner or the heir—were the moments when his influence was paramount over all other counsels. The intricacy of the system and the technicalities with which the courts tried to surround themselves, combined with the dread that owners of property felt for decisions of the King's courts, threw owners bound hand and foot into the arms of the legal profession, the enormous power of whose members to prevent organic change has been increased, first, by the ignorance of the early nobility; secondly, by the remarkable character of a body that has never possessed large and imposing foundations, whose sole corporate property has been its *esprit de corps* and its almost fantastic veneration for legal precedent; thirdly, by the absolute purity of the English bench—save for a very few well-known historical examples—during five hundred years of the history of jurisprudence. Judges have been sent to prison, judges have been deposed, and judges have been

tempted in a thousand ways, and alone among European nations, I may say alone among English institutions, judges have remained incorruptible in their dispensation of justice. The King's courts may have in old days tortured statutes and the common law; in the interest of the Crown or the feudal nobility, the equitable jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery was always there to see that such judgments were modified and justice done.

Thus sanctified not only by time but also by its purity, this system of English laws of property which has been handed down to us in its queer garb of feudal ideas, is still, as I aver, the foundation stone of the spirit of Conservatism in this country. Its lessons are taught daily to the Englishman over every lawsuit he engages in. Neither will any great or sweeping changes be effected in our social condition so long as the "spirit of the law" remains unchanged. An Act of Parliament may be drawn by lawyers, it has to be interpreted by the judges; and on the judges' decision the lawyers set to work again to devise methods for turning or defeating the intention of the legislature, or for modifying the effect of such Act of Parliament so that the Conservative spirit of property shall survive. Lawyers may be Radical in Parliament, they are the Tories of Tories in their own chambers or in court; and many is the Q.C. who must laugh at himself as he pulls off his gown at 4 P.M. to go down and vote with his Radical brethren in the evening in the House of Commons.

I have said this much regarding the history of the legal profession since it is important beyond all things to notice that it is from the hands of an eminent Conservative lawyer and Chancellor that we owe this remarkable Act of 1880 on the subject of settled land. This Act was introduced and passed in the House of Lords before it was sent down to the House of Commons. Its main and principal object is virtually to modify the abuses which the strict system of entail and settlements has created, while at the same time the principle of entail and settlement for tying up land for lives in being and twenty-one years after is not attacked. That the effect of the Act will be beneficial I will attempt hereafter to show. I will only notice in passing the changes which it brings about.

Formerly, before the passing of this Act, the powers of a tenant for life, whether he held under a will, a marriage settlement, or a settlement executed on the remainder man attaining his majority, depended in its operation solely on the terms of the trust deed; that is, the tenant for life could not, save by an Act of Parliament and the consent of all the parties in remainder, obtain any modification of the terms of the trust. If it was provided that no land should be bought or sold, not even an earthquake could modify the circumstances for twenty-one years. If it was provided that a certain

share of the yearly income should be expended in purchasing, say silver plate, not even the ruin of the rental could divert the available portion of the income from this first charge. The trust was absolute, and the court could only look to the terms of the trust deed. Lord Cairns' Act provides that in all and every circumstance the tenant for life shall have the indefeasible power of selling any land settled by entail (except the park and mansion)—and this without application either to the trustees or court for leave to sell or their approval of price obtained—the moneys realised from such sales to go as the land would have gone; it confers on the tenant for life the right to employ the surplus of moneys so obtained by sale of land or heirlooms, and apply these moneys in the improvement of lands that are retained, or in paying off mortgages on those lands. Such powers as these are greater by far than those of the Irish Landed Estates Court Act, for in this case the tenant for life had no control over the bargain, whereas Lord Cairns' Act goes on the assumption that it is the interest of the life tenant to effect an advantageous sale, and thus leaves him untrammelled by either lease or trustees in the management of the trust estate. It must be therefore perceived that an immense change has been operated. Every single acre of the land of England is now available for sale, and the reason why it does not change hands is, first, because there is no market for big properties; secondly, that owing to the legal obstructions of deeds and conveyances, it is impossible to arrange a market for small properties; and thirdly, that there is no effective desire on the part of the ordinary cultivators to purchase land at any price whatever. It is therefore surprising that Radical politicians do not turn their attention to this practical view of this land business instead of simply menacing the owners of all landed property. At this moment the vast majority of the agricultural land of England has fallen to Mr. Parnell's standard of prairie value—temporarily, I believe.

It is generally stated that on farms, small or large, the average value of the buildings, as required for modern agriculture, is about £10 an acre; *i.e.* to build a dwelling-house and homestead on a 400-acre farm, with all appliances, costs £4,000; or a 200-acre farm probably at the rate of rather more per acre; the drainage of this land can hardly be put at less than £5 an acre, and the incidental expenditure of fences, gates, walls, &c., at about £4 an acre. Besides this, we have the rates and taxes. If this land is let, as a great deal of the corn land of England is let to-day, at £1 an acre, this would exactly represent 5 per cent. to the landlord on the capital he sinks in the land in the shape of improvements which he and not his tenant is compelled to keep in permanent repair. On the other hand, the owner of town lands pays no rates

or taxes. He did not lay one brick upon another on the whole of his property; he rarely contributes one farthing to the roads, drainage, lighting, or water expenses. If he lets a piece of land on a building lease he reserves a high ground rent secured by claims giving him a right to enter on the houses built; at the expiration of the term, the houses become his absolute property, and thenceforth his leases are invariably rack-renting repairing leases, with re-entry clauses, and undertakings on the part of the tenant to paint the inside every seven years and outside every three years, and to make no structural alteration of any form without leave of the landlord. I have examined the form of lease of all the large owners of London property from the Crown downwards, and these are the invariable provisions. Every generation, as the aggregate wealth of the community becomes greater, the landlord of town property becomes more comparatively wealthy; while every generation, as local charges increase, and food becomes cheaper owing to facilities of access to the great grain fields of the world, the owner of agricultural land becomes poorer.

It is a strangely mistaken idea to suppose that the great agricultural landed interest of England enjoys any desirable monopoly. On the contrary, I will show that we are on the eve of a great industrial crisis when it will be impossible to sell agricultural land, much of which land would have to go out of cultivation were it not for the timely Act of a Conservative Lord Chancellor; and that even this Act will fail to relieve the land market unless a bold and determined attack be made on the permanent Conservative majority—not of the House of Lords—but of the legal profession and the conveyancing interest.

I have said that Lord Cairns' Act has provided betimes for a commercial crisis which is fast overtaking this country. His Act, however, only goes halfway; he did not venture to attack the legal profession. He has not suggested a word about land transfer. The simple cure is to sweep away at one blow the entire machinery of deeds and substitute in matters of sale a simple mode of registration of parcels bought and sold. Deeds were the invention of lawyers; registration is a complete substitute. Let us suppose that formerly you could settle and entail ships, stocks, goods, or anything else that was an imperishable form of wealth, in the same way that it has been the custom with regard to land; and let us suppose that on every bargain with regard to ships, stocks, goods, &c., we had to spend months drafting deeds, and had to pay for these deeds five and more per cent. before a bargain of any sort could be concluded in these articles; would it be considered a very great boon to the trade to say, We will relieve you of the difficulty you were in of not being able to sell these ships, stocks, goods, &c., under any consideration for twenty-one years, but we can do nothing at all to shorten the

months which it takes to draw these deeds of transfer, or cheapen the cost of these deeds?

Be it known that under the aegis of the present Lord Chancellor the legal profession procured the introduction and passing of a new Remuneration of Solicitors Bill, in 1881. The object of this measure was to substitute a percentage scale for conveyancing in the place of the old system of charging by folios. It cannot be said that this change has in any way lessened the legal cost of land transfer, though it may have in some ways facilitated the work of solicitors and their clerks by lessening the amount of matter to be engrossed, and consequently the amount of matter to be perused in examination of titles. The total costs of conveying an estate are, to all intents and purposes, the same as before—the vendor's and purchaser's solicitors are both paid for maintaining the complicated method of drafting deeds which has been bequeathed to us from feudal times. Besides these dual costs which, with incidental expenses of all sorts, fall little short of 10 *per cent.* on the transaction, especially if there are mortgages to be paid off and releases of covenant to be effected, there is a whole set of charges which an unfortunate owner cannot escape in the shape of auctioneer's or land-broker's costs. The "Institute of Estate Agents" is a body whose headquarters are London. That body consists of over fifty estate agents who do business in the London district. They advertise their charges, which are regulated by no legal restrictions. Five *per cent.* on the first £100, 2½ *per cent.* up to £5,000, 1½ *per cent.* for larger sums, is their advertised scale for sales of freehold or leasehold properties. Valuations and negotiations for sale are charged at similar rates, and besides these charges there are, in the case of the sale of lands by auction, charges for books and plans of properties sold got up at enormous cost, advertisements of sale, and incidental expenses, which bring up their total charges to nearly 5 *per cent.* on the purchase-money. The whole operation of transfer of an estate worth, say, £10,000, from A to B, if that property be sold by public auction or negotiated between land brokers and the transfer effected by two firms of solicitors, cannot possibly fall to much less than 15 *PER CENT.* on the capital sum, which passes into the hands of the agent and solicitors from out of the pockets of the vendor and purchaser conjointly. It can hardly be wondered at that, with such a system, a fall in the value of land produces a deadlock in the land market. I will ask any man of business where his trade would go to in England if his business was hampered and hindered by this mode of treatment? Of course in former times it was never contemplated that land should be sold at all. It was in the spirit of things intended that it should remain entailed in families for ever. Lord Cairns' Act has revolutionised this fundamental idea of 'an agricultural aris-

ocracy by giving life owners the power to sell whenever they please, and he has been forced to this by the condition of the times ; he has not, however, taken the further absolutely necessary step of rendering the land saleable by making its transfer feasible. I would ask readers to observe the enormous depreciation of the value of any goods that are hampered by any market restriction whatever, and I would ask owners of landed property especially to consider the enormous injury they suffer by having to pay fines of 10 and 15 per cent. on all their sales of land, to say nothing of the delays consequent on the intricacy of the transfer.

If we consider the vast competition which is daily growing up to threaten the very existence of the owners of agricultural land, I do not think the owners of this form of property can too soon realise the absolute necessity of extending their possible market. It was the universal custom in the days of the 40s. freeholders for landowners to buy up right and left any wretched cottage or tenement they could get hold of, so as to control the Parliamentary election; and on every large property in England there is an enormous list of cottage property, often in a wretched condition, which is the result of this old state of things. This form of property, after deducting for repairs, &c., does not in any case, whether the property be in good order or the reverse, pay more than 1 per cent. on its saleable value. Moreover, the difficulty of transfer and its cost often precludes its sale. The agricultural labourer cannot go to a solicitor to convey to him a cottage or a garden plot, or an allotment, and it does not pay the landlord to convey it to him at his, the vendor's, cost free of charge. Hence this form of property is in a condition of simple deadlock, while owners of property are attacked right and left by Radical dwellers in town for the condition of cottage property in the rural districts.

I now come to a somewhat more important class of lessees, viz., the holders of small accommodation holdings in the neighbourhood of important villages and rural towns. These holders are often highly rented and would often willingly buy their holdings were it not for their aversion to deeds and ignorance of modes of conveyance and the unnegotiable character of the property in case of their death. What is a man to do, who cultivates a ten to twenty-acre plot, and feeds a cow or two, and does a bit of jobbing work with a horse and cart for his neighbours, with a parchment deed which he does not understand, and which if he were to die would be a source of unknown expense to his family after him? The next class of lessees is the ordinary tenant-farmer, who is circumstanced much in the same way as the last class of holder. He has a pious horror of deeds, and even an agreement for a lease is a form of engagement he is extremely unwilling to enter into, as it binds him and his

family in case of his death or his serious illness. The larger class of tenant-farmer I need not so much consider; there is, in the present day, no heavy demand among that class to purchase their farms, since, as I have shown, they have the land at the present rentals, often for nothing, and only pay in rent interest on the landlord's improvements in the shape of farm buildings, drainage, &c. I have sometimes thought that tenants for life should be given power to contract with their tenants for an excess of rent which should be placed as a sinking fund towards the purchase of their holdings.

It is a well-known fact that a large portion of the land of England is mortgaged to an amount averaging, at least, one-third of its value. No statistics could be available for ascertaining what the fixed burden is, since mortgage-deeds never go beyond solicitors' offices, and owners of properties are naturally averse to their estate charges being known. The senseless sentiment which prompted owners to mortgage properties up to the hilt in former days of prosperity, rather than admit that they were impoverished, has resulted in these bad times, in the fact that many a mortgaged estate or portion of an estate is not producing to-day in rental two-thirds of the amount of the annual charge on it, and often less; for such is the entire deadlock of the land-market that this property cannot be sold, and one portion of the property which is unmortgaged helps to pay the interest at 4 per cent. on the property which is charged, while rentals continue to fall to a minimum. But it is a by no means impossible contingency that *half the land of England may be in the market without there being any effective purchasers.*

There absolutely is only one method of preparing for so evil a day, viz., by abolishing once for all, with one sweep, the entire feudal chicanery which surrounds our system of land conveyances. The State must afford means for wholesale registration of land on a very different basis to the feeble attempts which have been heretofore made in this direction.

In entering upon this subject of registration of land in England, we must consider what has as yet been done to meet this growing need. In the reign of Anne there were Acts of Parliament passed for the counties of Yorkshire and Middlesex, for the registration of deeds. These Acts are still in force, and in these counties deeds are still registered. Two Acts of Parliament—one Lord Westbury's Act of 1872 and Lord Cairns' Act of 1875—attempted to deal with this question of land registration. The legal minds which drafted these Acts, however, succeeded in rendering them completely inoperative, as may be seen from the evidence given before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on land titles and transfers, 1878.

In Yorkshire and Middlesex there are offices in which all deeds and wills affecting lands must be registered; the penalty in the case of

non-registration being that all interest in the land have priority according to the date of registration. Thus if A, an owner in fee, sells to B, and subsequently to C without notice of B's claim, then if C registers before B he obtains priority over him. This registration, however, is not a registration of *title*, but only of the fact that there has been a dealing with a particular piece of land. To find out the nature of the dealing you require to see the deeds themselves.

A still more ancient form of registration is that of the old manor court with regard to copyholds. The customs of ancient manors afford some of the most curious instances of the survival of obsolete methods. Here lies embalmed a whole system of feudal customs as to registrations of dues of fees and commutation connected therewith. Manors, as we know, are bought and sold that were originally grants from the Crown to certain persons, who received valuable considerations when transfers of copyholds held of the lord were effected. They comprised rights of toll, of ferry, of market, and even marriage dues, all of which have, in the present day, become valueless. The one right which makes them valuable is the right they confer of ownership to all minerals within the manor. The surface belongs to the copyholder indefeasibly; the subsoil to the lord. It would be curious to know how much of the large fortunes of great landowners is derived from manorial rights under other people's properties throughout England.

In these old manor rolls, which are still kept up at the expense of the lord, and by the payment of fees to his legal representative, the nature of every transaction regarding the land is clearly set forth. The rolls, however, are not referable to any scale or map; and the identity of the piece of land which is affected is entirely untraceable, owing partly to the fact that old descriptions are preserved long after they have become obsolete.

What I wish to arrive at is a combination of both principles of registration: (1), a registration of *title*; and (2) a registration of evidence as to *IDENTITY*. Yet it is, as I will attempt to show, out of this ancient custom of the court-rolls of a feudal manor, that we must evolve a working system for facilitating transfers. The manor must become the county, the manor court the Registration Court of the chief town of Quarter Sessions, and the court-rolls must be the map of the Ordnance Survey of the county, together with the ledgers in which will be entered all details of ownership and mortgage on the property in question. The Ordnance Survey map of the county would have to be corrected in accordance with the entry of sales in the court ledgers, and this map should be open to the inspection of any person who paid a simple inspection fee to the registrar. The Ordnance Survey is of sufficient size to mark off the most delicate boundaries of fields, roads, &c.,

and is in habitual use to-day for preparing maps of descriptions of properties conveyed by sale or lease as now practised. This vast Government expenditure which heretofore has been of little public use, may thus become the future basis of this much-needed reform, for without such a preliminary survey no Registration Court would be possible. The whole subject of land transfer is exhaustively treated in the evidence given before the Select Committee of the House of Commons as reported July 16th, 1878.

The report set forth the complete failures of both Lord Westbury's Act of 1862 and Lord Cairns' Act of 1876. These Acts attempted to provide a system of voluntary registration of titles to land; owners failed completely to avail themselves of these Acts, since registration conferred no advantage; it was as costly as a sale of the lands in question, owing to the title having to be proved in the usual form; and lastly, solicitors naturally dissuaded their clients from taking business out of their hands. The evidence of the registrars and assistant registrars, Mr. Spencer Follett and Mr. Hallett Holt, gives a very complete view of the difficulties of registration if titles have to be proved. A whole constellation of conveyancing solicitors give valuable evidence to prove that "registration of deeds" is all that could possibly be required, which simply means that solicitors must continue as heretofore to feed upon the landowner, while Sir Robert Torrens affords a useful and instructive sketch of the land registration system he was instrumental in establishing for South Australia. The pretended objection of the solicitors to the Australian system was that the land titles held direct from the Crown in the colonies are a far simpler affair to register than our complicated conveyances. Suggestions are made that if possessory titles were registered on the occasions of sale or resettlement the efflux of time would render such registration absolute. It did not, however, occur to any of the witnesses to suggest turning the whole difficulty, by "setting aside the examination and proving of deeds *in toto*," and substituting the simple process of making a possessory title become *de facto* an absolute title by the simple method of efficient public notice, and forcing owners to look after their own interest by preventing other persons registering their lands. The committee remained absorbed in the belief that deeds could not be got rid of by any other method than by a systematic proof of the titles, and the entire weight of the legal profession was exerted to make their evidence tell in the same direction.

It cannot, however, be too clearly stated that if the smallest remnant of sanctity is permitted by the legislature to remain about a deed affecting the sale of land, the legal profession will infallibly employ this means for inducing their clients unversed in legal matters to have recourse to this system in preference to any alternative the liberality of the legislature may offer in its place. The consequence would be that legislation on this matter would prove abortive,

and that for the one-hundredth time in land legislation the legal profession had frustrated and defeated the legislature. Compulsory registration of titles would be most unfair on the owners of property, except in the case of future settlements. Life owners could not pay for the expense themselves, and it would be unbearable to allow the legal profession to reap such a harvest out of the corpus of properties as enforced registration of a title within a specified number of years would entail. A simple, and at the same time efficacious, mode of registration suggests itself which would avoid the proving of a title. Let Registration Courts be created in every chief town of Quarter Sessions, and let the expenses of the registrar's office be paid by a county rate levied on the freeholds in the county assessments. As the Registration Courts came into function these expenses would be more and more nearly met by the fee paid for the registration of titles, which would be infinitely smaller than the present cost of conveyancing deeds. The ledgers of the court would be of two forms; first, a ledger containing all holders in fee, and, secondly, a ledger containing a register of life owners, and all owners in remainder, and the mortgages would be entered in both ledgers in a separate column. A separate scale of fees would be charged for registration by life owners and settlements, since people must pay for their luxuries. Of course, when a tenant for life died, the person next in title would be put on the register instead. As the character of the properties becomes smaller, details would become less, so that with regard to small parcels the entries would become exceedingly simple and easy of registration. The fundamental principle of the entry should be the tracing from the Ordnance Survey of a convenient scale which would accompany every entry, and this map would be referable again, whether it were a small plot or a large farm, by a number to the larger part of the 25-inch Ordnance Survey, which would be posted and coloured in the names of owners as a yearly standard of check or reference. Copies of ledgers and maps might be kept, to insure safety of title, in the County Court, and should be open to public inspection for the payment of a fee to the registrar.

If it be objected that such a system would lay bare to the curious the family arrangements of parties and the financial condition of their properties, it must be replied that everything is not obtainable, and that if secrecy of family arrangements is indispensable, it is not proposed to make immediate registration compulsory. If registration is not to be compulsory, it will then be said, Where is the probability that persons will be desirous to register their land? The answer is found by giving the foundation principle of the change we wish to introduce regarding the question of title—namely, the *abolition of deeds*. Let it be provided that any owner of property in a county may, on the affidavit of three reputable resident neighbours, not

necessarily landowners, but taxed to the county, go to the Registration Court of the chief town of Quarter Sessions of the district; and there enter on the ledger of the court those lands described in the affidavit; let evidence be given to the registrar that six months' clear notice has been served on all boundary owners to this land, and let there be twelve months' further notice given by advertisement regularly from the registrar's office in the local papers that such and such lands have been entered for the registration of titles in the name of A. B. If after the expiration of the period of eighteen months no objections have been raised by other parties, who can show cause to the registrar that the title to these lands may be called in question, let this entry of these lands on the ledger of the office be an indefeasible title, and from henceforth take the place of all deeds. An attested copy of this entry, with a tracing of land in question on the back of certificate, obtained on payment of a fee, to be at all times a sufficient title to the owner. If, however, either the boundary landowners, whether of lands registered or not, or any party who, in consequence of the public notice, may show cause why the presumptive owner may be not the real owner, come forward and present through himself or his solicitor a caveat in support of his allegations, let the pretending owner be then compelled to prove his title in the ordinary course, an action for costs being of course open to this person against the objector if he can prove the objection is frivolous. The principle of such an enactment as this would be much the same as that which holds good regarding the right to trade marks. It would lie with the owner to look after his own property and see that no one laid claim to his ground. Provided that sufficient time is allowed to elapse during which objections can be raised, and sufficient publicity of notice is insured to all parties interested in the matter, no real injustice could be done. A saving clause would be provided that in case any person, through no fault of his own, such as absence or poverty, &c., had been unable during the specified time to raise objection to the registration, an equitable claim might be upheld against the person who had been registered as owner—to alter the registration, or if the land had been resold for damages against the person who had falsely registered.

It is needless to point out that a measure of this sort would raise the entire conveyancing profession in arms, as it would at one blow strike off the legal shackles in which they now hold the entire land of this country in an iron grasp.

The system of land transfer in Southern Australia is easily studied in the two Acts of the legislature passed December 3rd, 1861, to amend the real Property Act of 1860, and also in the further Act of November 30th, 1878, which amends the Act of 1861, and repeals the Real Property Act of 1869. The Acts are numbered 22 and 128, and received the assent of the governors, Richard Graves, Macdonnell, and

W. M. Drummond Jervois respectively. The Act of 1861 sets forth the system of registration of freehold and leasehold properties and establishes forms for certificate of title, of transfers, of lease, of mortgage and encumbrance, of powers of attorney, and caveat of objectors to the title, and lastly sets forth a scale of fees for all land operations of every description; the office of registrar-general and the method of posting registrations is fully set forth, together with all concomitant circumstances. The Act of 1878 amplifies and consolidates these provisions, and gives amended schedules for all forms of certificate of ownership, &c.

Covenants affecting land are to be deposited with the registrar, but notice of their contents are not given to parties not interested. Leases of every form are provided for and lessees are given the power of compulsory registration over the lessor. Trusts of every description can be registered either as affecting the whole or a portion of the land contained in the instrument of the trust.

Provisions are made against fraudulent entries or forgeries of certificates, penalties to extend to fourteen years' penal servitude; the Supreme Court is appointed to full jurisdiction in all matters affecting registration, and can make orders for rectifying the registrar, or adjudicating between owners and claimants of every description. Notices of ejectment come before the Supreme Court for non-fulfilment of contracts, and an assurance fund is established to guarantee owners against errors of the registrar. The certificate of title is of the simplest form, and sets forth in a few lines that A B is seized of an estate (in fee-simple or for life), subject to encumbrances, *i.e.*, as are notified on endorsement. A complete description of the property then follows, together with reference to map of county, section, or allotment, and referable again to public map deposited in Surveyor-General's office. Then follows the grant and the signature of the Registrar-General.

All the other forms of land operations are of the same simple and convenient order. There would be no fear of difficulty in establishing an equally simple mode of land transfer in this country without interfering in any way whatever with *settlements, trusts, or life interests*, if once the legislature determines to turn a deaf ear to the objections of the legal profession, and give all present possessing owners the right to go and register their lands according to a system similar to that set forth in this article.

Such a scheme as that here described is in every way a natural corollary to the Settled Land Act of 1880, for it leaves on one side the entire question of entails and settlement—it deals simply with a question of exchange; it departs from no principle which that Act respects, while at the same time it offers a means of opening up a market to a species of property which is at present simply unsaleable owing to the narrowness of the market, and the impossibility of

dealing with land except among a day by day more limited class of customers who are now unwilling to purchase on any terms owing to the feeling of insecurity which has been created by the public speeches of members of the present Government.

I believe that the present crisis in the agricultural condition of this country, and notably in Ireland, would be greatly alleviated in the near future if such a scheme as I have described were seriously considered. The abolition of entail and settlement, the compulsory division of property even, would do no good whatever, so far as regards the land question, until the whole system of title to land is taken out of the hand of the lawyer and placed in the hands of the State. A formidable opposition would no doubt be made to such a scheme from the entire legal profession, and we may expect that every device will be employed to demonstrate the impossibility of this or any other similar plan. We may be, however, encouraged by the success which this Act of 1880 has already met with, to hope that, if such a measure were introduced into the House of Lords, it would find a more or less ready acceptance at the hands of the largest holders of real property in England. The entire value of their property is affected by such a measure. It would relieve their estates from an intolerable bondage, it would raise the value of their property, while at the same time it would appeal as a measure of liberal legislation to the moderate portion of all parties in the House of Commons. Owners of properties would be able to register their lands as they chose, or as resettlement occurred they would rid themselves at their own time and good pleasure of the legal expenses and forms for which they have paid so dearly for centuries. They would be able to offer their properties for sale free of all charge for proving titles, and they could divide their lots for sale in a manner which would encourage an entirely new class of purchasers; the yeoman would thus reappear amongst us after the lapse of a century and more, and the agricultural interest instead of being composed for the most part of only large landholders unable to sell, would become extended, as has so often been desired, by embracing a new body of persons interested in the cultivation of the soil. The forty-shilling freeholder has ceased to be a burden to the mind of the Tory squire since the days of the Ballot Bill and the Reform Bill of this year—the motive for excluding small holders of land has vanished, even sporting right will no longer stand in his way, the landowner is at last becoming a trader like his neighbours, and it cannot be long before he recognises that the so-called *privileges* which he has enjoyed of surrounding the tenure of land with every species of legal obstruction, is to the detriment of his property and the disadvantage of those social institutions in which he has for generations placed his trust.

MARLBOROUGH.

THE ARGUMENTS OF A PEER.

HAVING undertaken to state my views in the Fortnightly on coming land legislation, I find myself, when half-way through the task, assailed by a satirical nobleman, who, whilst I pause to take breath, advances to the front, and disports himself with the *abandon* of a curate at an auction of advowsons, or a licensed victualler at a local option meeting. If Lord Stanley of Alderley had contented himself with attacking, in the course of his eight pages, Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Bright, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Parnell, the Foreign Office, and the January number of this Review, it would have been no concern of mine to answer him; but as he more specifically falls foul of myself, and accuses me successively of being a demagogue, an avaricious landlord, a misrepresenter of existing law, an utterer of wild talk, a person so ignorant as never to have heard of cattle plague and foot-and-mouth disease, and so weak in the memory as not to remember the elementary data of agricultural finance, I must, if only to prevent candid friends from consigning me to Bedlam, exchange a thrust with this antagonist, and show which of us is the man of facts and which the man of fancies. I hope, in the course of the encounter, to beat out some sparks of light which might not have yielded themselves to a quieter mode of treatment, and so to redeem from the barrenness of a mere polemic the conflict in which I find myself unexpectedly engaged.

Lord Stanley, for reasons which are, of course, obvious, does not call me to task for my few pages in the Fortnightly, but for a pamphlet or lecture on the land question, which I published some little time back, and in which I advocated certain specific measures of reform. He begins by saying, in good round terms, that this pamphlet, on which the reader of the Fortnightly, not having the original before him, must be expected to take Lord Stanley's word, is "an electioneering bid for the support of the more ignorant voters." Well, we cannot all be peers; and when a man has been for years engaged on the study of a public question of the first order of importance, he naturally expresses his views upon it before those whom he seeks to represent in Parliament. A pamphlet of twenty-four closely printed pages, many of them of an extremely dry and technical character, is surely an odd bait wherewith to ensnare the ignorant; and the voters of Oxford on both sides who take an interest in land reform—and they are many—will be obliged to Lord Stanley for the description which he has given of them. It might further be suggested that the functions of the peerage, already not small, will be

found inconveniently burdensome if they are to act as censors of public opinion, and to lay down the law as to what measures may or may not be discussed between candidates for the House of Commons and their constituencies. To say that certain proposals for reform are an electioneering bid is the same thing as saying that these proposals are made from other motives than genuine conviction, and that they constitute a violation of political morality. It may be agreeable to persons who are born into a hereditary legislature, who are responsible to nobody, and who cannot be deprived of their powers, to claim the right of veto over discussion as well as over law, and to brand as immoral any suggestions which are distasteful to their class. But proof is one thing and assertion another; and if the reader has begun by accepting Lord Stanley's statements on his *ipse dixit*, it is possible that before reaching the close of this article he may see reason to ask for some further species of evidence.

Lord Stanley entitles his essay, "Radical Theorists on Land." He has a strong objection to such persons; and as I have no great opinion of them myself, and also know that every reformer is *prima facie* put down as a theorist by those who do not agree with him, I stated in the lecture in question that my own opinions were derived from some years' experience in the management of corporate estates, and that I had the misfortune to be personally interested in a small landed property, of which I had a hundred and fifty acres on my hands. This gives Lord Stanley a fine opening. "It is evident," he says, "that Mr. Fyffe does not practise what he preaches, namely, a sufficient reduction of rent." I take up this personal challenge, and admit for the occasion that a writer's practice is to be the test of his doctrine. The tenant of the farm in question was a needy man, dependent on relatives who called up their capital, so that if he had had the farm rent-free he could not have stayed there. What then, according to Lord Stanley, ought I to have done? To have let the farm, in its exhausted condition, for what it would fetch; to have thrown upon the new tenant the business of bringing it back to average cultivation; and when he had done this, to have held him at my mercy as to any future increase in rent; for the Agricultural Holdings Act gives the farmer no compensation for "the raising of a farm from its deteriorated condition to a normal state of cultivation," inasmuch as this, in the profound language of the author of the Act, is an "amending the bad, and not advancing the good to better."¹ Not holding with Lord Stanley's views on this point, but being, as he says, a Radical theorist, or as I should say myself, a person capable of seeing where good can be done, I took the rehabilitation of the farm into my own hands, and have laid down twenty-three acres of grass-seeds, planted a large orchard, sunk two wells, discovered and

(1) Griffith's *Agricultural Holdings Act*, 1883, p. 1.

worked a sand-bed of some value in a clay country, kept a carpenter at work for seventy-three days at gates, fences, ox-cribs, &c.; oak-fenced and extended to a third of an acre a labourer's garden (not agreeing with Lord Stanley that labourers ought to be worked so hard as only to leave them time to cultivate one-eighth of an acre); purchased a right of way which will bring us within two instead of five miles of a railway-station, and began the construction of a road. When the farm is let again, it will be a very different place from what it would have been if I had acted on Lord Stanley's advice, and let it in its ruined condition for what it would fetch. I know that every day it remains in my hands it will improve; and why is this? Because, being a small and not a great landowner, holding a few hundred acres of land where my neighbours hold many thousands, and not being in the main dependent upon the land, I am master of the land instead of the land being master of me. And when the farm is let again, there is no single point that I have advocated in theory that I am not prepared to accept in my own practice. If a proposed tenant, suitable in other respects, does not agree as to the amount of rent, I should be perfectly willing to go to a local authority to get the rent fixed, feeling sure that such authority would intelligently remunerate a landlord for his improvements. The tenant should hold the land with right of appeal against arbitrary or causeless removal, and against any undue raising of the rent, and he should have perfect freedom to sell his tenancy to any one he pleases for the best he can get, subject to my own similar right of appeal against an unsuitable successor. In all this I can see no shadow of injustice towards the landlord, and cannot understand why my worthy critics in the *Spectator* and elsewhere should be so much more sensitive on the subject of landlords' rights than I am myself.

In dealing with the well-worn question of entails and settlements, Lord Stanley says that "to read Radical theories on the subject one would think that they" (*sic*) "knew nothing of Lord Cairns' Settled Estates and Conveyancing Improvement Acts of 1882;" and he adds, in his courteous way, that I "allude to the first of these Acts only to misrepresent it entirely." The ground given for this charge is that I have stated that where there are trustees with power of sale a life-tenant desirous of selling has to get their consent. It is not in conformity with the rules of literary practice for a critic to cite from an earlier edition of any work a passage which has been altered in subsequent editions, without mentioning that he is doing so. This, however, is what Lord Stanley does. He attacks me for a slip of the pen which was corrected in the second London edition of the pamphlet, published ten days after the first, and three weeks before the appearance of Lord Stanley's article. Without attributing too high a character to his lordship's critical faculties, I should imagine that they might be better employed than in extracting

materials for accusation out of misprints which an author has corrected weeks before. As to Lord Cairns' Settled Estates Act, the insufficiency of it arises, apart from all question of obtaining the consent of trustees (which is only necessary when the mansion and demesne are to be dealt with), from the very nature of the settled interests which it protects; that is to say, it leaves the purchase-money subject to the trusts of the settlement, and so does not give the landowner that motive for selling which operates in all ordinary transactions, namely, the desire to obtain the purchase-money. The only way to effect this, and to bring land into the market like all other commodities, is to abolish settlements altogether, and to make the ownership of land absolute. So far from meeting the arguments against entails and settlements, Lord Stanley asserts that "it is a sufficient answer to all Radical arguments against these," that in a Bill introduced by Mr. Jesse Collings there is a clause permitting an owner to bequeath land to one person for life, with remainder to one other. It has been stated in the newspapers that this clause was inserted in the Bill by the draughtsman against Mr. Collings' desire, and that Mr. Collings has withdrawn the Bill in consequence. Whether this is so or not, I neither know nor care. Mr. Jesse Collings, who is not even a peer, much less Pope, would be the last person to pretend that any action or decision of his own could be "a sufficient answer to all arguments," Radical or otherwise. But it is characteristic of Lord Stanley's method that he thus lumps together all who disagree with him, and treats each person as responsible for all the rest collectively. Thus, after inveighing against certain extreme opinions which are known to me only by report, and on which I have never said a syllable; he coolly begins his next paragraph with the words: "Mr. Fyffe's pamphlet *also* goes into the question of building-leases." Lord Stanley's indiscriminating pencil draws one rough figure which stands as a portrait for us all. Whether the reason of this is that Lord Stanley, attaching the same sort of sanctity to his own opinions as St. Paul attached to the law, considers that "he that offends in one thing offends in all;" or whether, holding with Prince Windischgrätz, that the human species "begins at the baron," he denies a separate individuality to persons under that order, might be an interesting subject of inquiry for those who occupy themselves with psychological studies, but it would be out of place here.

One essential point of difference between my critic and myself is in our estimate of the amount of capital required to set British agriculture on a satisfactory footing. The existence of an enormous deficiency of capital, and the necessity of drawing capital by some means into the farming business, is the very starting point of my arguments in favour of an improvement of farmers' tenure; and I have named the sum of £100,000,000 as that which is probably required.

On this Lord Stanley's comment is as follows:—

"Mr. Fyfe says, that though a million acres have been turned into grass, there is no increase in the number of cattle. Apparently he has never heard of cattle-plague, and foot-and-mouth disease. He says, 'probably £100,000,000 at least is required to set pastoral farming on a satisfactory footing.' This is very wild talk; does he want £100,000,000 to stock the million acres withdrawn from corn, and to slightly increase the existing stock on the old pastures? And did he remember that £100,000,000 is nearly double the whole rents of Great Britain, agricultural-rent and ground-rent together?"

What Lord Stanley can mean by saying that I have apparently never heard of cattle-plague and foot-and-mouth disease, when I state *totidem verbis* that the farmers' losses have been partly in the actual death of sheep and cattle, is more than I can understand. But let that pass. Lord Stanley then says that my estimate of the amount required to set pastoral farming on a satisfactory footing (he omits the words, "and to make the most out of the land") is wild talk. It is nothing of the kind. I formed the estimate with the most deliberate care, and advisedly placed it greatly under the mark. The process by which I arrived at it was the following; first, by observing the estimates of good authorities; second, by comparing these estimates with the official agricultural returns of the last ten years; and third, by reckoning the amount of capital necessary to restore various farms known to myself, and roughly calculating what sort of average per acre this might indicate. The lowest estimate that I can anywhere find of the farmers' losses since 1874 is that of Mr. Smith Woolley, President of the Surveyors' Institution, who places it at £73,500,000, adding, however, that in his opinion this is rather an under-estimate than otherwise. That is, according to Mr. Smith Woolley, whose estimate I accept as the lowest and least favourable to myself, the farmers have £73,500,000 less capital than they actually had in 1874. I presume nobody imagines that in 1874 farmers employed more capital than was required to do justice to the land; but in addition to this, whereas the total farmed acreage of Great Britain in 1873 was 31,102,629 acres, it is now 32,465,861, showing an increase of 1,363,241 acres. If the difference between Mr. Smith Woolley's estimate of the actual loss and my own estimate of the amount of money required to set things right is more than would suffice to work the additional land and to cover the transition from wheat-growing to pastoral farming and arable-dairying over a great part of England, we have all been living in a dream. Lord Stanley asks whether I want £100,000,000 to stock the million acres withdrawn from corn, and to slightly increase the existing stock on the old pastures. I never heard of any one before who imagined that by the sudden appearance of this number of cattle on our shores all the agricultural losses of the last ten years would at one stroke be wiped out. I cite the non-increase of the number of cattle, in spite of the large quantity of land transferred from corn to grass, as the most striking and palpable evidence of financial exhaustion; Lord Stanley

absurdly treats it as if it were the whole thing. The purchase of a great additional number of cattle and of the 4,000,000 sheep by which we are actually below the returns of 1874, would only be the first step in the calculation. "But," adds Lord Stanley, "did Mr. Fyffe remember that £100,000,000 is nearly double the whole rents of Great Britain, agricultural-rent and ground-rent together?" The agricultural-rent alone of Great Britain on which income tax is paid amounts to about £56,000,000. The multiplication-table, as I remember it, taught that twice 56 is 112; but then it was made by theorists who had not the advantage of consulting Lord Stanley of Alderley. To the £112,000,000 there would have to be added double the amount of the ground-rents, which come to several millions,—nobody knows to how many, for under our existing revenue-system there exists no machinery by which the amount of ground-rents can be discovered,—and we should then have a sum far above £100,000,000. But the truth is that Lord Stanley, in his random way, has jumbled together the agricultural and the ground-rents of Great Britain, and taken the return of the former as inclusive of both. The official return of "land" under Schedule A is purely agricultural. It is obtained from the answers made by farmers to Government inquiries issued every three years, and is checked by the figures in local assessments: on the farmer's return of his rent Government bases its own assessment of the farmer's profits for income tax. But there exists no return of the income tax paid on ground-rents; and no single individual or department of Government knows the amount of these ground-rents; for the occupier or intermediate lessee first pays income tax upon a gross value which includes the ground-rent, and Government, having no concern with the matter, and not basing the lessee's assessment upon his ground-rent, asks no questions. Nor are ground-rents assessed for any local purpose, for the simple reason that they escape local taxation altogether. It might be well that our ground landlords of the hereditary legislature should gain some acquaintance with a species of property regarding which they are likely before long to be called upon to vote. At present Lord Stanley in writing on the land question is like a child who sits by the side of some grown-up person playing the piano, and, after occasionally bringing his hand down with a crash, looks round with an air of delight at the superiority of his own performance. The exhibition is diverting enough for awhile, but it is apt to become tedious. Even if Lord Stanley had hit upon the right amount of rent, what on earth would this have proved in reference to the farmers' losses and the capital necessary to replace them? A tradesman's shop catches fire, and he loses goods to the value of £500. "Impossible," cries Lord Stanley, "because his rent is only £250." And yet there are people who are tempted by seeing peers' names among the directors of insurance offices!

I have dwelt at some length on this question of the exhaustion of

farmers' capital, because, apart from any controversial interest, it lies at the very root of all discussions of agricultural reform, in so far as these relate to landlord and tenant. There are two other points in Lord Stanley's arguments which I propose to take up, because they bear on matters of immediate public interest, in which a clear statement of facts will, as I conceive, be useful. The first of these is the agricultural question of railway charges and the preferential rates given to foreign produce; the second is the town-question of the tenure of dwelling-houses, as elucidated by the reports recently obtained by Government from our representatives abroad. Among the objections which I have urged against our present land-system, one is that it has so far made an end of the art of the small cultivator, that we have annually to import from abroad about thirty million pounds worth of produce, which, unlike wheat, could be as cheaply, or more cheaply, produced at home. Instances of this are—butter, £12,000,000; cheese, £5,000,000; potatoes and vegetables, £4,000,000; poultry and eggs, £3,000,000. On this Lord Stanley remarks: "Mr. Fyffe does not appear to know that this is chiefly owing to the differential rates in favour of the foreigner on the Kent and Sussex railways, which have not yet been overhauled by the Railway Commission." As I farm in Sussex myself, nothing would be more agreeable to me than that the Kent and Sussex railways should reduce their rates for home produce; and I trust that Providence will prevent my neighbours and myself from injuring our good cause by extravagances and exaggerations like those of Lord Stanley. The question of preferential rates is an extremely difficult one. It is no doubt annoying to the Ashford farmer to know that hops are carried the whole distance from Boulogne to London, *via* Folkestone, for 17s. 6d. per ton, while from Ashford to London the rate is 36s.; but the answer of the railway company is that if lower rates were not charged to the foreigner over their line, the hops would either go by sea (the cheapest mode of transit), or would not come to England at all. The distance to London from a village in the interior of France is so great that, if lower rates were not charged for a part of the journey, the goods could not, except where they can bear sea-transit, be sent to the London market at all. The lowering of fares for the foreigner means an approach to equalisation of total transit-cost, without which we Kent and Sussex people would have an absolute monopoly. I cannot find anywhere in the evidence before the Rates Committee of 1882, that it is alleged that a French producer (unless he happens to live on or close by the sea, in which case he has of course the natural advantage of sea-transit) can send his goods to London for a total charge less than that paid by the Kentish or Sussex farmer. He has to get his goods first from the interior of France to the coast, then across the sea, then over the English railways to London; and if the third

stage in the transit is done cheaply for him, he may nevertheless have to pay much more for the whole journey than the Kentish man, who, for a third of the distance, pays a higher rate per mile. This at least is the contention of the railway companies, and it was so far accepted in principle by the Select Committee of 1882 that this Committee definitely pronounced against the rival system of equal mileage rates which was demanded by English producers and traders. If there are particular instances of undue preferences now existing, I hope the Commissioners will overhaul them; but as I am not a hereditary legislator, and therefore do not possess Lord Stanley's prophetic power of foreseeing both what cases will be brought before the Commissioners, what evidence will be given for the plaintiffs and for the defendants, and what the judges will decide, I do not feel confident that their decisions will result in Englishmen producing for themselves the £30,000,000 worth of dairy and vegetable produce which they now import from abroad; in fact, I think the statement nonsense. The utmost that can be said of the existing differential charges is that they may in some cases bring the Frenchman as near to the London market as the Englishman. The question then is, are the soil and climate in the north of France so much better than in Kent and Sussex that our farmer, for reasons of soil and climate, cannot compete with the French peasant? I do not believe it for a moment. The reason is that, owing to a very great extent to our land-system, he has lost the art which the French peasant possesses. I know plenty of Sussex farmers, and like and esteem them; but let the railway rates be what they may, they could no more compete against the French peasant in eggs, poultry, and vegetables than they could compete against Jean Maria Farina in Eau-de-Cologne. The reason is that the Frenchman understands the business of *la petite culture*, and the Englishman does not. I need not say that in all this I have no desire to argue against a lowering of rates for home producers if Parliament can see its way to such lowering without inflicting a wrong on anybody.

To conclude:—Lord Stanley in his general attack upon Radical theorists is naturally exercised in mind that the Government should have made inquiries abroad with the view of ascertaining how far the system of building-leases, with which Mr. Broadhurst's Bill proposes to deal, exists in other civilised countries. The reports of our representatives abroad are about as unpleasant a piece of reading for ground landlords and the advocates of our present system as Mr. Broadhurst himself could have desired; and it is not surprising that Lord Stanley, with this very stiff piece of work before him, jibe in every direction rather than fairly face it. There is a mode of expression, which, without actually misrepresenting a fact, conveys so erroneous an impression that the reader may be as much misled as if there had been a direct violation of accuracy. This is the case

with Lord Stanley's remarks on the Ambassadors' Reports on Building Leases. "It is to be hoped," he says, "that the Foreign Office was not so simple as to expect to find a condition of things, which has grown up by degrees under English law, in countries such as Servia, Greece, and others, from which Montenegro has been omitted." It is not a question of Servia and Greece—that is, as Lord Stanley would suggest, of undeveloped countries, where nobody would look for such arrangements—but of Vienna, and Berlin, and Madrid, and Lisbon, and Amsterdam, and Geneva, and Brussels, and Rome. In none of these places does the system of Building Leases exist, though according to Lord Stanley the Building Lease is the natural outcome of "great commercial activity." Lord Stanley quotes in italics a sentence from the Report relating to Spain, which states that since 1842 rent-contracts "have been free from all improper interference on the part of the law." I should have been ashamed to quote this sentence in a discussion on Building Leases; it refers to agricultural-rents, and the very next paragraph of the Report is as follows: "Adverting to the queries contained in Lord Granville's dispatch above referred to, it may be stated that dwelling-houses in Spain, whether in town or country, are mostly freehold, and that the system of letting land on long building leases is unknown." That system has no doubt been introduced into Paris, where, when the French have had as much experience of its evils as we have ourselves, they will probably follow us in attempting to get rid of them; and it exists, in certain towns of Sweden, and in those chosen abodes of civilisation and commercial activity, Turkey and Russia. Nowhere else in Europe is it known. The laws do not prevent it, but the people will have none of it. "No person," we read, in Prussia and Germany generally, "would be disposed to erect at his own cost a permanent structure on a piece of ground held in such uncertain tenure."—"The English notion of degrees of estate in land is not only absent from the Swiss law, but is almost incomprehensible to the Swiss themselves. Absolute ownership is the only condition known to them, and they possess no idea of such tenures as exist in England." If there was ever any doubt of it before, these Reports prove beyond all question that the building-lease system of England has arisen from the concentration of land in a few hands; for, where owners are numerous, people can buy their own freeholds, and would turn their backs on a vendor who proposed that after forty, sixty, or ninety years the house that you are about to build should become his property. The Report can be bought for fivepence; and never was more sound and profitable information placed at the service of the English people for so modest a sum. At what price a careful reader who has gone through the Report and then reads Lord Stanley's comment upon it may be inclined to appraise the latter, I would not presume, in these depressed times, to conjecture.

C. A. FYFFE.

ENGLISH INTERESTS IN NORTH AFRICA.

HAS England any concern in the future of North Africa? Is this country henceforth condemned only to play the part of an uninterested spectator in the politics of the Mediterranean? Has our diplomacy of the past two centuries in the matter of North Africa been based on some vulgar error or some diplomatic delusion? Can we with impunity remain indifferent to the ultimate fate of Tripoli and Morocco? Shall we be justified in assisting France, or some other equally aggressive power, in the absorption of the remaining Barbary States, by an exercise of that benevolent indifference which so materially hastened the practical annexation of Tunis to Algeria? In a word, has England, or has she not, any stake in the scramble for North Africa? The plain answering of these questions cannot much longer be delayed by those who are to-day or who may be to-morrow responsible for the safety of the Empire. The whole subject has so intimate and inseparable a connection with the great dangers which have, as if by magic, risen up around us in all directions, that a solution of the problem for good or evil must, I think, be speedily arrived at. It matters little whether the task fall to the lot of Mr. Gladstone or Lord Salisbury, the Mediterranean difficulty can be shirked or shelved no longer. It lies at the very basis of the great questions of our road to India and our future action in Egypt, and its impartial consideration at the present juncture becomes a matter of almost paramount importance.

On the 25th February Lord Salisbury made a very remarkable speech in the course of the debate on Egypt. "With Mediterranean politics, as such," he said, "we have no reason to concern ourselves. France may be mistress in Algeria and Tunis; Morocco and Tripoli may go their own way; but Egypt stands in a peculiar position. It is the road to India. The condition of Egypt can never be indifferent to us." The words "and Tripoli" are omitted in the *Times* report, but they did not escape the vigilance of Lord Granville. Two days later Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs thus called the attention of the House of Lords to the utterances of Lord Salisbury: "The noble Marquis," said Lord Granville, "wants us to occupy the districts in the Soudan, when only yesterday he stated, to my great surprise, that we have no interests in the Mediterranean, and that it is a matter of indifference to us what becomes of Tripoli and Morocco." The speech of Lord Salisbury and the rejoinder of Lord Granville appears to me to raise in a sufficiently convenient form the issue which I propose to briefly consider.

It must be admitted that the responsibility for our North African policy, or rather want of policy, during the past seven years rests pretty equally on the shoulders of Conservatives and Liberals. An

unhappy consciousness of many and great mistakes on both sides should afford a sufficient excuse for withdrawing the discussion of the subject from the overheated arena of party strife. Since 1878 we have been so rarely right and so persistently wrong in our dealings with these unfortunate North African States, that even partisans may very well agree to consider the matter dispassionately, with a view to the adoption of some wiser and more consistent line of action for the future. Nay, more, their doing so has become an absolute necessity if they would avoid a national disaster. When a parliamentary leader of the influence, ability, and experience of Lord Salisbury openly proclaims in unmistakable terms the indifference of England to the politics of the Mediterranean and to the destiny of three great Moslem provinces which border it, it is surely high time that his opinions should receive respectful consideration. In the spirit I have indicated I shall endeavour to point out the legitimate extent of England's interests in the future of the Mediterranean, and to indicate at the same time as briefly as possible the results to be apprehended from the continuance of a policy which at present adds to a vacillating interference in the affairs of Egypt a complacent carelessness as to the ultimate fate of Tunis, Tripoli, and Morocco.

The North African question is well-nigh a century old. It originated in the traditional rivalry between France and England; it has been perpetuated by the undisguised determination of France to found a great empire on the southern shores of the Mediterranean, and the necessity which England feels of preserving from all possible attacks her road to India. France and England are rivals; there is a direct and irreconcilable conflict of purpose in their political aspirations. If France founds her empire England loses her hold on her road to India, and *vice versa*. A collision would be disastrous for both parties, but it can only be avoided by maintaining the independence of the States which, from no fault of their own, have come to form the subject-matter of the contention. This was once thoroughly understood in Downing Street, and succeeding generations of Foreign Ministers acted accordingly. Then came the time when, most unfortunately for all parties concerned, the North African question passed into an acute stage, which was in a measure the outcome of the incidents which attended and followed the Berlin Conference. The now historical hint to "take Carthage" sealed the doom of Tunis, while the decision arrived at about the same time to bring about the deposition of the Khedive Ismail through the medium of direct European intervention was equally fatal to the peace of Egypt. The inevitable crisis was not long delayed in either case. In 1881 the storm broke in both countries; since then North Africa has witnessed little else than a succession of wars and rumours of wars. France has annexed Tunis and added one more province to the empire Car-

thage Gauloise of the future. England has waged two costly wars, and has succeeded in placing her hold on the road to India in imminent peril. If she were to act on the theory of Lord Salisbury it would, I fear, slip altogether from her grasp. While France is busily engaged in dispensing the blessings of civilisation to the Tunisians, and in watching for further opportunities of checking Moslem fanaticism on either side of her African dominions, we are declaring, in theory at least, our determination to quit Egypt as soon as possible, while we are engaged in practically arranging for the neutrality of the very water-way the control of which Lord Salisbury believes to be the justification of our presence in Egypt, and in preparing to wage a prolonged war with the avowed object of "smashing"—nobody knows why, where, or when—a native leader whom we are pleased to call the False Prophet, and who has been described by our own Premier as the chosen representative of a nation rightfully struggling to be free. Our present undefined and contradictory position is fraught with evident peril. Absence of policy has proved in our case a most ruinous experiment. An active policy of self-effacement would only effectually consummate our political suicide. If a banker lost the key of his strong-room the key of his safe contained in it would serve him nothing. If England releases her hold on the Mediterranean she ceases, as it were, to command the strong-room. The Suez Canal will only resemble the useless safe. It is precisely because we should follow Lord Salisbury's advice in the matter of the preservation of the road to India that we must of necessity disregard his counsel as to our concern with Mediterranean politics and the destiny of Tunis, Tripoli, and Morocco. The conquest of Tunis is a *fait accompli*, but I shall briefly allude to it, as her fate should serve us as a warning and an example. Tripoli and Morocco have still "to go their own way." They may be destined to form new French provinces, or their independence may still help to maintain our hold on the road to India. It is very possible that the arbiter of their destiny may be Lord Salisbury himself.

English statesmen were once keenly alive to the importance of Tunis as a factor in the Mediterranean question. They viewed with jealousy and suspicion any attempt on the part of a rival power to assert an undue influence at the Tunisian Court. If Louis Philippe sent the Bey a French coach, Lord Aberdeen took care to counteract it by the timely present of an Axminster carpet; and when Napoleon III. pressed on Muhamed-es-Sadek the acceptance of six guns, we found an antidote in some English saddlery and a life-boat. All this may seem very trivial now when our allies and rivals are in undisturbed possession of the coach, the carpet, the saddlery, the life-boat, and of the regency of Tunis itself; but the politicians of the past were right after all. The Tunisian question has brought into existence a most formidable array of polemical literature in many languages, and one

risers from its examination with an uncomfortable conviction that a great naval power in possession of the coast of Tunis must inevitably exercise something very like a complete control over the central portion of the Mediterranean, and more especially over the passage of the Malta Channel. The French at the present moment hold with a firm hand the Goletta roadstead and the land-locked harbour of Bizerta. "If the Tunis lake were only dredged and deepened," writes Commandant Villot in 1881, "and the coast fortified, and if a powerful navy were stationed in the Tunisian roadstead, not only the path to Egypt, *but the road to India through the Suez Canal would once more be closed to the people of the West.*" Mr. Perry, the American consul, an admittedly impartial witness, wrote thus in 1869: "Tunis has the finest position in North Africa. Commercial preponderance and *the control of the Mediterranean* are the attractions for the Powers which dispute with each other for its possession or its neutralization."

No good can come of repeating in any detail the thrice-told story of the taking of Tunis. The invention of the Kroumirs, the reiterated disclaimers as to annexation or protection, the profuse promises of a strict observance for treaty rights and privileges, the wanton disregard of international law to the prejudice of the Porte, the coercion employed to wring from the Bey and his ministers the Kasr-es-Said convention, the proclamation of a protectorate in open defiance of disclaimers and promises, the fruitless note-taking of our own Foreign Office, the hopeless rising of the Arabs, the shelling of Sfax, the wanton desecration of Holy Kairwán, and the final submission of all foreign residents in Tunis to the jurisdiction of the French Court by the abolition of the constitutions. This shameful tale of aggression and deception has been for twelve months and more a matter of ancient history. Crying in the wilderness about the fate of Tunis was an ungrateful task at any time; it is worse than useless now. If the story of the first-fruits of a policy of indifference to the future of North Africa should serve as a warning and an example, the small and insignificant number of criers in the wilderness would consider themselves richly rewarded for their pains.

Five years ago England enjoyed an unrivalled popularity amongst the North African Arabs. The sons of the desert judged us by the light of past history and time-honoured traditions, and they trusted with child-like faith to the word of an Englishman. It is impossible for us to ignore the fact that Mediterranean politics have, whether we like it or not, an inseparable connection with the question of the future of Islam, nor can we forget that England is a great—perhaps the greatest Moslem power in the world. These considerations are alone sufficient to prevent our looking on with folded arms while others are playing an active part in the scramble for North Africa. It is difficult to over-estimate the strength of that all-powerful bond of

race and religious sympathy which not only links together the inhabitants of North Africa from Egypt to Morocco, but unites in a greater or lesser degree the followers of the Prophet in three continents. As far as my immediate subject is concerned its influence is not confined to the shores of the Mediterranean; it extends southwards to the Sahara and even to the Soudan. The great confraternities (*Khouans*) which possess agents and convent-sanctuaries (*Zaouia*) throughout the length and breadth of Islam intensify and at the same time give a practical and often a political form to the sentiment of religious union. Nowhere are they so powerful and so well organised as in North Africa. Almost every Arab "wears the rose" of the Senousia, the Kaderia, the Rahmania, or the Tijania. The internal arrangements of these mysterious associations are singularly complete, and their method for rapid intercommunication of intelligence has successfully baffled even the vigilant care of the French authorities. The action of the followers of Senousi in Tripoli during the past two years has been involved in considerable mystery. On the one hand he is reported officially to be opposed to the Mahdi, while a more recent rumour represents him as taking an active part in his favour. The late Colonel Stewart discovered that Muhamed Ahmed is himself an affiliated member of the Kaderia brotherhood, which has its chief centre at Baghdad, and which possesses *Zaouia* in every part of North Africa. Thus it happened that the violation of the sanctity of Kairwán in 1881 was felt and resented far beyond the limits of Tunis, and that the fall of Khartoum and even the events on the Afghan frontier of 1885 will have an almost immediate effect in the oases of Tripoli and the convent-sanctuaries of Tunis and Algeria.

• It is instructive at the present juncture to examine the French idea of the future of North Africa by the light of that abundant supply of official and unofficial polemical literature which forms a characteristic feature of French politics. The memoirs of Captain Carotte in the *Bulletin de la Société de la Géographie* (1852), affirm that "the possession of Tunis would give France political frontiers and enable her to annex a great oriental empire, at the same time guaranteeing to her supremacy both in Europe and in the Mediterranean, and assuring her a monopoly of African trade." In a letter of the ill-fated Colonel Flatters, published early in 1881, we find the same ideas. Colonel Flatters speaks of his instructions from M. Freycinet to form a French party at Mourzouk, and of the absolute necessity of pushing forward to the Soudan. On the 20th June, 1865, Napoleon III. wrote thus to Marshal MacMahon, Governor of Algeria, in a document which may be fairly described as the political manifesto of France in Algeria: "When our manner of regenerating a vanquished nation becomes an object of envy to the fifteen millions of Arabs scattered over other parts of Africa and Asia, when our supremacy established at the foot of Mount Atlas appears to them an inter-

vention of Providence, that day the glory of France will resound from Tunis to the Euphrates." General Yusuf, in his popular pamphlet *La Régénération Militaire*, tells us plainly that "Africa belongs to-day to France, and that by the aid of her camels and dromedaries France will go to the Soudan, and from Tunis to the Euphrates."¹ It is useless to multiply quotations on this subject. The conversion of the Mediterranean into a French lake occupied equally the attention of Napoleon I. and the Bourbon princes who succeeded him. Diplomats may protest and disclaim over Tripoli and Morocco as they did in the case of Tunis, but the real extent of French aims in North Africa has been described over and over again with refreshing frankness by successive generations of French political writers.

Signs are not wanting of coming troubles both in Tripoli and Morocco, although the existing complications in Asia may possibly avert the storm for the moment. The voice of Europe has generally assigned Tripoli to Italy, whenever the last days of the North African scramble shall arrive, by way of compensation for her disappointment at the loss of Tunis. France, however, has no notion of having a European neighbour between Tunis and Egypt, or of giving Italy a footing on the North African littoral. The empire of the future must be *Carthage Gauloise*, and nothing else. Only the other day an ominous semi-official telegram went the round of the French press. It ran thus: "Although perfect tranquillity reigns in Tunis and Algeria, the fall of Khartoum has produced a certain excitement in Tripoli. M. Paul Cambon has declared that France will repress any display of fanaticism in the vicinity of her frontiers." It would not be difficult to find Khroumirs in southern Tunis if political exigencies required them, but for present purposes so general and comprehensive a term as Tripolitan fanaticism is amply sufficient. We shall soon doubtless have to make up our minds as to how far the fate of Tripoli concerns us. Nobody disputes for a moment that it forms an integral part of the Ottoman Empire, but so did Tunis when the French subjected her to the ordeal of a mission of civilisation. There is always the danger that the long-suffering Turk may show signs of resistance at last, and a reopening of the Eastern question must be avoided at all costs. This consideration is, however, of comparatively little importance, for the connection between Tripoli and Egypt is so apparent to everybody that a policy of indifference on our part must assuredly result in disaster. The ports of Tripoli are almost equal in importance to those of Tunis, and as far as their present capacity is concerned they are immeasurably superior. Rear-Admiral Smyth, in his work on the Mediterranean, lays considerable stress on the value of the spacious harbours of Tebruk and Bombah, and adds, in a note, that in 1801 the French Admiral Ganthéaume saved his whole squadron by getting into Tebruk, a port of which our officers were utterly ignorant.

The approach to Egypt by land from Tripoli is by no means so difficult as is commonly supposed. At various times armies have crossed and recrossed the stretch of country between Mesurata and Alexandria without meeting with any notable obstacle to their march. Cato and his ten thousand men performed the feat in thirty days. Beechey, in his *Northern Coast of Africa* (p. 269), assures us that the whole district in question "neither is nor ever was so destitute and barren as it has been represented; the part of it which constitutes the Cyrenaica is capable of the highest degree of cultivation. The proportion of sand which is actually to be found in the Syrtis will by no means authorise us to call it a sandy region, and the proportion of water which it actually possesses will not justify us in asserting that it is unprovided with that necessary." If the land route to Egypt is anything like what the most competent authorities assure us it is, a policy of *laissez faire* as concerns Tripoli is clearly inexpedient—arguing always from the hypothesis, which is generally admitted by all classes of political thinkers, that England must maintain her hold on the highway to India.

In Morocco the signs of French intrigue are still more evident. The late French chargé d'affaires, M. Ordega, was in too great a hurry to share the laurels of M. Roustan, and he has been replaced by M. Féraud, who has already done good service to the Republic by alternately nursing and checking the fanaticism of the Tripolitans. M. Ordega was hasty and indiscreet. He lacked the ability to give his too manifest intrigues an air of decent plausibility. The support he accorded to the Sharaf of Wazan in his treacherous attempts to undermine the authority of the Sultan, his open relations with two questionable journals devoted to his interests, and his advocacy of French claims and pretensions, however doubtful or tainted, rendered him an unfit instrument to work out the plans of France in Morocco. He was sadly overmatched by the superior skill and experience of Sir John Drummond Hay; and so it has come to pass that the management of the tangled skein of French diplomacy at Tangiers has come into the more deft hands of M. Féraud. Lord Nelson always expressed a very strong opinion as to the strategic importance to England of the coast of Morocco.

The following is the account given me directly by a thoroughly reliable eye-witness of the proceedings of the French at the capital of Morocco:—

"Some years ago the Emperor selected an English officer to drill his troops and infuse something like order and discipline into the Moorish army. Shortly afterwards the French Legation at Tangiers intimated peremptorily to the Sultan that it was absolutely necessary to select French officers as instructors. For the sake of peace and quietness it was arranged that one French officer should be appointed for two years. When he arrived he brought unasked an Algerian sergeant with him. Their presence was followed by a demand for the nomination of other French officers in different parts of

the interior. This also was reluctantly conceded. The captain and sergeant were next quietly replaced by a major of engineers, a captain, a doctor, and another Algerian non-commissioned officer. The engineer officer occupies himself solely in making military sketches of all parts of the country, which he transmits regularly to Paris with any other information he can collect. The Emperor is forced to satisfy the exigences of the whole party in the matter of pay, lodging, and presents, and he finds it very costly to please them. There is no need whatever for the services of the French officers either at the capital or in the interior, several native competent instructors having been drilled and educated at Gibraltar. For obvious reasons the French officers employed in Morocco are constantly changed, so as to allow as many individuals as possible to become acquainted with the country. The protection accorded by the French to Algerian subjects is greatly abused, and tends to undermine completely the authority of the Sultan. We all know that the blow to the independence of Morocco will come from France. Fall it must, although complications elsewhere may postpone the crisis."

It is curious to observe that the appointment of military instructors was one of the earliest moves of French diplomacy in Tunis. Twenty years ago General Camponon, the ex-Minister of War, filled a similar post at the Tunisian Court. He very nearly succeeded in bringing about a conflict between the Bey and the French, but Monsieur Drouyn de Lhuys was out-manœuvred by Lord John Russell, who defeated the schemes of the French by a combination with Turkey and Italy. Lord John Russell fully realised the concern of England in the politics of North Africa.

I have endeavoured to explain as shortly as possible my reasons for presuming to differ from so able and courageous a statesman as Lord Salisbury. An excuse for my temerity must be found in the pressing urgency of the present situation and in the personal experience I can bring to the consideration of the subject. Passing events are rendering the efficient maintenance of our road to the East against all comers the great question of the day. No Government can hope to succeed who is not prepared to grasp the difficulty boldly and deal with it effectually. There is no place in the present crisis for party wranglings or partisan advocacy. Once the control of the Mediterranean lost, the possession of the canal will serve as nothing. This is precisely what will happen sooner or later if we fail to realise our true position in relation to the North African question, of which the Egyptian difficulty is the principal but not the only ingredient. Our true safety lies in the deliberate reversal of the policy of interference and aggression which has been in vogue during the past seven years, and which has at length culminated in a great national danger.

The combined result of our diplomacy and our wars has been disastrous and humiliating. We have only succeeded in pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for France, and we have received scant thanks for our pains. Although we have surrendered to her on every point in Tunis, where we have torn up our treaties at her bidding, and handed over a powerful colony of our subjects to the

jurisdiction of her courts, we are met in Egypt with insolence, intrigue, and defiance. France does not want Tunis or Algeria; her aim and object is, and always has been, the possession of a North African Empire stretching along the whole coast-line of the Mediterranean. We failed to recognise this when we listened to the blandishments of M. Waddington and the smooth speeches of M. Gambetta. We have played the game of our rivals to their hearts' content, and if they have not got all they wanted already we must attribute it to a chapter of accidents which has been too strong for our folly. If we would avoid still greater calamities and still more serious complications we must in a measure fall back on the policy of those who went before us. Our real remedy lies in the strict observance of treaties and in a rigid conformity to international law. We must act justly to all parties concerned, including the Sultan. We must, if possible, set up in Egypt a strong and vigorous government, capable alike of satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the Egyptians and opposing a steady resistance to the attacks of internal and external intrigue. Our policy in the Soudan hardly comes within the scope of the present question. Unless we are prepared to commit its reconquest to the troops of the Porte our action must of necessity be limited to the defence of Egypt proper. The passing burst of military enthusiasm which hailed with acclamation an advance at all risks on Khartoum and an aimless war of vengeance, will cool down before the autumn under the combined influences of a calmer phase of public opinion, an increased and harassing income tax, and the certain sufferings of our troops under a tropical sun. For such a war as this England can neither spare her children or her money. It is becoming day by day more apparent that we must preserve in our hands the road to India. I contend that we cannot do this more effectually than by maintaining unimpaired our influence in the Mediterranean. We must clearly recognise both our interests and responsibilities not only in Egypt, but in the affairs of Morocco and Tripoli. The time has come when France must of necessity suspend the absorption of her neighbours in the interests of *Carthage Gauloise* unless she would wantonly imperil the peace of the world. If we have really no concern in the politics of North Africa, if we have no stake or part or voice in this illegal scramble for the appropriation of the remaining independent State of Barbary, and if the control of the navigation of the Mediterranean is in no way an affair of ours, it is difficult to understand why we ever went to Egypt at all, and how we are to profit by the mere possession of a canal the approaches to which will be in the hands of others, whose navigation we are about to declare free in deference to the wishes of Europe and the susceptibilities of France.

A. M. BROADLEY.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

MONTH succeeds month, and as it brings with it no abatement of our Imperial anxieties, brings with it no perceptible change in the relative position of the two parties in the State. We are within a measurable distance of war with Russia. Three weeks ago the Government narrowly escaped, by a majority that dwindled to fourteen—a majority which, when it is remembered that between thirty and forty members of the House of Commons are officials, is smaller even than it seems—defeat in the popular Chamber on a vote of censure. Another resolution of censure, the debate originated by which will have concluded before these lines are in the hands of the public, upon an international agreement which no one likes, and which most persons cordially dislike and distrust, is in progress; and yet, notwithstanding all this, notwithstanding their past blunders, their present difficulties and dilemmas, their future uncertainty, Ministers are to all appearance as strong as ever, and the Opposition certainly weaker, more distracted, less able to take advantage of ministerial mistakes. It remains to be seen whether the reappearance of Lord Randolph Churchill in the House of Commons after the Easter holidays will inspire his party with any capacity of united and effective action, or will help them to recover from the state of impotence and paralysis into which they have fallen. As matters are, the Seats Bill has produced the exact results which, from the first, we ventured to predict. There is not only no opposition to it; there is not even any plausible show of opposition. Every division taken has but served to bring into fresh relief the schisms and jealousies by which Conservatism is rent. The compact entered into between the Conservative and Liberal leaders has rallied and animated the followers of the latter, while it has taken all spirit and strength out of the followers of the former. Nothing less than a political miracle has been worked. A constitutional revolution is in course of accomplishment by what amounts to universal consent. The chief disagreement is as to the names by which the electorates, which will give us a wholly novel House of Commons, are to be called. By a curious coincidence, just as we in England are adopting the *scrutin d'arrondissement*, the French Chamber is busy with substituting for *scrutin d'arrondissement*, *scrutin de liste*. Gambetta perceived, years ago, that the principle of representative government would never receive full justice in his country so long as local interests predominated in the selection of its members of Parliament. Comparatively few, whether among the Conservatives

or the Liberals, seriously apprehend, as the consequence of *scrutin d'arrondissement* in England, the evils which it is designed to cure by *scrutin de liste* in France. No doubt we are taking, after our usual fashion, a leap in the dark; but could there be a more significant illustration of the difference between the two countries than that the Redistribution Bill, against the principles of which the contemporary action of the French deputies is so direct and vigorous a protest, should be passing through the English Parliament almost unchallenged?

It is, unfortunately for ourselves, as impossible to speak definitely of the issue of the dispute between England and Russia as of the fate of the Egyptian agreement or of General Graham's operations against Osman Digna. Whether a few weeks or days hence we may be at war with the Government of the Czar depends entirely upon Lord Dufferin's interview with the Ameer and upon the reception given by Russia to the proposals and the policy that will be the result of this conference. We cannot abandon Abdur Rahman. To do so would be not merely to invite attack upon India, but to undermine the moral influences—to destroy our character for loyalty and good faith—which are as essential to the maintenance of our Indian Empire as our army itself. It is, therefore, out of the question to talk of conceding the Russian claims. On the other hand, it is clear that we cannot reasonably expect Russia to acquiesce in a condition of things which exposes her troops to the raids of the unruly and savage tribes that inhabit it. These tribes have never been more than theoretically subject to the suzerainty of the Ameer, who to-day exerts over them no real authority. The point, therefore, is, where is the new frontier to be drawn? and the ultimate solution of the difficulty must be found in a military or genuinely scientific boundary line within the undoubted dominion of the Ameer, which we must render impregnable, and defend at any cost. If this is not done there are only two other conceivable alternatives, either of them equally to be deprecated. One is for England to retire to the Indus, the other is war.

The answers given by Ministers enable us to form a correct idea of the progress of negotiations between the English and Russian governments. No attempt is made to disguise the fact that the Russian answer to Mr. Gladstone's first demand that the outposts should fall back from the debatable points was an absolute refusal. Her Majesty's Government have not insisted upon the demand, although both Lord Kimberley and Mr. Cross have admitted that in the opinion of the Ministry these points are within Afghan territory. They have, in fact, allowed the validity of the Ameer's claim, which Russia disputes, to be referred to negotiation. But they have also allowed him to maintain his garrison at Penjdeh, and have reiterated

their intention of securing for him "all the territory to which he is justly entitled." Of course every hour spent while the two Governments may, for all we know, be travelling on the high road to a peaceful understanding, increases the risk of hostilities being precipitated by a quarrel between the outposts. In order to minimize this danger, there has been framed a temporary convention, which forms a curious chapter in diplomatic history. On March 13, Mr. Gladstone informed the House of Commons that it was agreed that no further advance should be executed by either side pending the final decision. Apparently the Prime Minister gave this assurance on the strength of earlier telegrams from Sir Edward Thornton of a general character, signifying that an accommodating spirit prevailed in St. Petersburg. No definite answer to the specific proposal which originated with the English Government had then arrived. It was not indeed received till the 17th, when it was promptly announced. M. de Giers accepted the agreement, or as Mr. Gladstone now preferred to call it, "the arrangement," but with one awkward reservation,—“unless in the case of some extraordinary reason, such for instance as a disturbance at Penjdeh.” When Colonel Alikhanoff's appearance before that fort in the hope of exciting a Turcoman rising against the Afghan officers is remembered, it is obvious that this reservation puts it in Russia's power to create both an excuse and a justification for further movements. Indeed, the Government has since received information that the probably unprompted zeal of that officer has again been at work with the same object.

The English Government, by withdrawing their first demand, have met with a rebuff, which is considered in Russia, and to some extent on the Continent, as a diplomatic triumph for the Czar's advisers. The triumph may very well turn out to be more apparent than real. For the arrangement, as Lord Kimberley expressly stated on March 17, is only temporary, and by no means "involves our acquiescence in the presence of the Russian troops where they now are for an indefinite time." That is to say, unless Sir Peter Lumsden's report modifies the opinion as to the limits of Afghanistan previously held, the Government will be confronted with the necessity of reiterating their former demand or of breaking faith with their ally. Meanwhile, in the continued absence of his Russian coadjutor, the English Boundary Commissioner is rapidly proceeding with his work of inquiry and delimitation.

Deploable and dangerous as is the existing tension, we nevertheless incline to the opinion that war will be avoided. The spark is actually held in suspense over the powder magazine. The severance of the most delicate thread would cause it to descend; swords with edges as sharp as razors are flashing round the filament; and yet there is a good hope that the explosion may after all be avoided. Is there, it may

well be asked, any justification for this view? Does it rest upon a sentiment or a fact? Is it only the wish which is father to the thought, or is there anything in the situation which renders war improbable? All that we know of the Russian movements during the last few months points to the conclusion that they were deliberately instituted to frustrate and hoodwink Sir Peter Lumsden. Russia, in other words, has been doing her utmost to steal a march upon us. What was her goal? The reply which naturally and immediately suggests itself is that the goal can have been nothing less than Herat. Now if the assumption that Russia had conceived, and was ready to execute, the design of occupying, or at least pressing on to, Herat, be correct, where are we to find the agency which, interposing itself in the path of Russia, summarily arrested her progress? That inquiry again admits only of a single reply. The Eastern question, it must be remembered, whether in Europe or Asia, is a logically connected and a closely compacted whole. It is not an aggregate of isolated groups of political problems. It is as continuous as history itself. One might as rationally assert that historical periods were independent of each other, as endeavour mutually to detach the Occidental and Oriental acts in that tremendous drama which is popularly known as the Eastern question. Germany has done nothing more than remind Russia of a fact as plain as the sun at noonday and of a law as inexorable as the correlation of force. The Czar, as Prince Bismarck put it to him, could not limit the consequences of a campaign against England in Central Asia by the geographical boundaries within which it was undertaken. Of course the Czar knew this already. What he had yet to learn was the attitude which Germany would adopt when the European continent should be shaken by the ground-swell of the Asiatic struggle. While it is at least doubtful whether the commencement of a war between Russia and England in Central Asia would be the signal for an attack by the Hungarians on the Slavs, and for commotions in Bulgaria and Roumania which would compel the interference of the Powers; while we rather believe that there is for the present nothing to fear from the reciprocal animosities latent, or expressed, between the different races of the dual empire, who can doubt that Russia would no sooner be preoccupied in Afghanistan than that the Austrians, stirred by an impulse they could not resist, would press on to Salonica? But Austria could not lave her feet in the Aegean without administering a shock to the whole economy of Eastern Europe. Prince Bismarck, for instance, might, in consideration for the latitude he was allowing Russia in the East, claim proprietary rights over certain parts of the Balkan provinces. As a matter of fact, there is the best reason for believing that the German Chancellor informed the Czar that if he went to war with England he must not count too confidently upon the independent friendship of

the Fatherland. As we have repeatedly stated, there are in Germany conflicting policies. There is the peace policy of the Emperor; the aggressive and Oriental policy of Bismarck; the western policy—the policy, that is, in favour of a *rapprochement* between France and England—of the Crown Princess. These differences notwithstanding, there is the best ground for saying that the Chancellor is honestly anxious to avoid war during the life of his Imperial master. But war could not be avoided if there were a rupture on the Afghan frontier between Russia and England.

This matter no doubt afforded a theme for conversation when Count Herbert Bismarck recently held his now famous interview, of more than an hour's duration, with Lord Granville. But the first question then discussed was the attitude of Germany towards England, in respect of Egypt. We have made certain concessions to Germany in the Cameroons. To us they are of slight importance, and if Germany values them the only comment is that she might have had them before. In return we have obtained from Germany—and there can be no doubt that the understanding has been explicitly arrived at between Lord Granville and Count Herbert Bismarck—the support of Germany in our Egyptian policy. The delay in signing the convention which is now before Parliament was due exclusively to the obstinacy of Prince Bismarck, and the immediate sequel of his son's visit to London was the removal of that impediment. Nothing, as has been said above, can be much less satisfactory than the document which Parliament is now asked to ratify. It is a choice of evils, and the only question is whether the evil which we choose is to be the greater or the lesser one. Little more will be gained, by the formal adoption of the scheme, which the Powers have approved, than the immediate pecuniary relief of Egypt. Europe or England comes to her rescue with a loan of nine millions, and two years more are given for considering the political and financial future of the country. The real victory is not with England or France, with Germany, Austria, or any other European state. It is with the bondholders, and with the members of that financial ring who now dominate the political system of the Continent. There is something unequivocally mortifying in the point to which England has, under pressure, come round. Perhaps it might have been otherwise if our Government had in the first instance recognised that the origin of our Egyptian troubles was financial rather than political; that Europe, when we began actively to interfere in Egypt, had a double hold—one in consequence of the law of liquidation, the second in consequence of the International tribunals—over the country; that, before and after the bombardment of Alexandria, England, by separating herself from France, and by suffering the law of liquidation to remain intact, ejected her co-trustee from the

banks of the Nile, without taking the corresponding and logically obligatory step of cancelling the deed. The abortive Conference of last summer in London, convened by the English Government on the hypothesis that the interest on the coupons must be reduced, was followed by the despatch of Lord Northbrook, whose report, published for the first time within the last few days, threw doubt upon the expediency or necessity of any such reduction. Tardily, with an ill grace and in egregious inconsistency with their previous declarations, Ministers have now in effect adopted Lord Northbrook's view, which is also the view of the French delegates, who held to their original conviction at the London Conference, and whose tenacity upon this subject was the cause of its collapse. It therefore comes to this, that for two years more the bondholders are, with the single exception that they are subjected to an infinitesimal tax, to have their way, and that when this period has expired it will be necessary to reconsider the whole Egyptian question. This may be expediency, or it may be the recognition of dire necessity, but it is not statesmanship, and it is not to be wondered at that it should be regarded as profoundly unsatisfactory by the English people.

Whatever its immediate or ultimate issue, our difficulty with Russia in Afghanistan will not be entirely a matter of regret if it forces the Government to a conclusion, as regards the Soudan, that ought not to be delayed a day. Nothing can be more certain than that public opinion will not tolerate the recommencement of Lord Wolseley's campaign six, five, or four months hence, for the purpose of smashing the Mahdi at Khartoum or at any other spot which that mysterious potentate may select. The object of the Nile expedition was to relieve Gordon. Why it failed, whether it would have succeeded if it had been undertaken earlier, what degree of blame attaches to Ministers for their tardiness in despatching it, these are not now the questions to consider. The sole point of importance is that directly death did for Gordon what Lord Wolseley failed to do the whole motive of the campaign disappeared. If it had been practicable to inflict a decisive defeat then and there upon the Mahdi, we ought of course to have seized the opportunity for doing so. Equally of course we ought still to hold ourselves in readiness to try conclusions with him whenever he harasses us again. But is that any reason why we should pursue him at infinite cost, both of blood and treasure, across the pestilential wastes of a waterless desert? If we are to fight him, let us at least do so on the ground which is most convenient to ourselves, and not dissipate resources which could be profitably employed—which may be essential elsewhere—upon a foe who can always baffle us by retreating into his native fastnesses. There is an intelligible reason perhaps for smashing Osman Digna. That is to say, it is essential that tranquillity should be maintained

on the Red Sea littoral. If the Mahdi carries the war against us into a region at which Egypt proper will be jeopardised, we can smash him then and there. Our obvious course is to draw a frontier not farther south than Wady Halfa, and to defend that with all our might. We have, in other words, to do in Africa exactly what we have to do in Central Asia: to trace a boundary line, which shall be essential to our position, and not to allow it to be transgressed. Judging from past experience, millions of money and hundreds or thousands of brave lives would be expended on a second march to Khartoum. Not ten per cent. of either would be necessary if we had, as possibly we may have, to fight the Mahdi in the region of Wady Halfa.

But it will be said if we abandon the notion of annihilating the false prophet on the spot which was the scene of Gordon's martyrdom, we shall be bringing ourselves into contempt with the Mussulman population, both in Egypt and in India, and inviting an attack upon ourselves. The reply to these apprehensions is obvious and conclusive. If we have to hold Egypt by military force, in the name of common sense let us restrict our efforts to Egypt. If we are to be called upon to quell disaffection in Hindostan, let us concentrate our troops there. Positively the only argument in favour of instituting a wild-goose chase after the Mahdi is summed up in that mischievous word prestige—mischievous not because there is no such thing as prestige, or because prestige is under all circumstances valueless, but because it dupes so many people into mistaking the shadow for the substance, the phantom for the reality. There is absolutely no enterprise, however crazy, which might not be vindicated on an analogous plea. The business of England is to deal—and to take care that she has strength to deal—with actual and not hypothetical dangers. Happily, we may be sure that the course which patriotism and prudence suggest will be urged upon the Government by necessity. No one who understands the temper of the English people or the omnipotence of public opinion can suppose that the renewal of the Soudan expedition, as originally planned by Lord Wolseley and the Government, later in the year, is practicable. What we have had already is enough; and when Graham has once fulfilled the task entrusted to him, the sooner the last English redcoat is withdrawn from the torrid sands and the inhospitable rocks of the African deserts the better.

But as most of the public men of England have been during the past month, and are now, none is busier or is confronted with a more heavy and critical task than the Prince of Wales. Before the Easter holidays are over he will for the third time in his life have placed his foot upon the soil of Ireland. He will pass a fortnight in the country, and though he need not anticipate any other than a cordial and respectful welcome, it cannot be said that the omens are unre-

servedly auspicious. Moreover, he is accompanied by the Princess of Wales, and the bravest of women might well shrink from the disagreeable possibilities which an alarmed imagination might conjure up. The advice has been freely tendered to their Royal Highnesses that they should abandon, even at the eleventh hour, the idea of their trip. Greatly to their credit, they have declined to entertain such counsel. That any political good will result from their sojourn on the other side of St. George's Channel is scarcely to be hoped for. It comes too late. Had a royal residence been established in Ireland fifteen years ago, had the Queen or the Prince of Wales then introduced the custom of passing three or four months of every year in Ireland, had the viceroyalty been disestablished and the executive business of the office handed over to the Chief Secretary, many troubles which have since occurred might have been prevented. But it is not the fault of the Prince of Wales that this step was not taken. The Queen has never favoured the idea. None of her Ministers have been sufficiently bad courtiers to press it upon her. The notion, whenever it has been revived, has fallen through. But now that it was revived by no less a person than Lord Spencer, the Prince of Wales had no alternative but to adopt it. The present Viceroy of Ireland is crowned with the responsibility of a Cabinet Minister, and in declining to be deaf to his suggestion the Prince of Wales, though he may not be able to confer any signal boon upon Ireland, will be performing an act wise and politic in itself, and signally honourable to him.

In the speech of Prince Bismarck before the Reichstag on March 2, and in the subsequent declarations of Earl Granville in the House of Lords, we have a satisfactory clearing up of that diplomatic misunderstanding which arose from the treatment of colonial topics in England and Germany. As the dispute has terminated in an amicable fashion, it is hardly necessary to find fault with Prince Bismarck's brusquerie or our own negligence and procrastination. The colonising spirit which has seized Germany evidently took Lord Derby by surprise, and the German White Books have been a disagreeable form of awakening; but now that both nations have agreed through their ministers to come to terms, we can heartily endorse Earl Granville's remarks, "I am sure that it is more than ever in the interest of Germany and ourselves that our relations should be good at a time when we are about to meet in almost every part of the world." And if public speeches and declarations on both sides do not provide us with the picture of a complete eirenicon, the visit of Count Herbert Bismarck to England on a pacific and most important errand, as well as the visit of the Prince of Wales to Germany to take part in the birthday festivities of the venerable German Emperor, may supply any possible deficiency, and prove that a com-

plete accord has been arrived at between the august personages and heads of departments in both countries. For the first time, therefore, in our history, German colonial interests will be closely bound up with our own, and "Greater Germany" will march on "Greater Britain." The scene of diplomatic labours is being shifted from the well-known boundaries of Europe to the distant countries of the South Atlantic and Pacific. German merchants and adventurers, smitten with the new-born craze of colonisation, and possessed with the idea of commercial expansion, are scanning eagerly the distant regions of New Guinea and Central Africa, or wherever else a new field for their energy presents itself. From one point of view German colonisation, if real and national and enduring—which by the way some question—may bring England and English colonists an indirect benefit. It may divert the stream of German emigration from our own dependencies, and leave a clearer field than at present exists for our own labourers and small capitalists. The keenest competitor in every department, whether on farms or in stores, who confronts an English emigrant in the colonies is the German. Let the Germans, therefore, by all means develop their Greater Germany, and leave Britons in absolute possession of the opportunities of wealth which their own colonies afford. We have never grudged them the rights of citizenship when they came as fellow-colonists to our settlements, and we do not under these new conditions fear their rivalry. But the question of over-population in our small islands is daily growing in difficulty; we may need the waste lands of our colonial empire more urgently than hitherto, and when the pressure becomes intolerable we may prefer the room to the company of Germans or any other nation.

The importance of our colonies as providing outlets for a surplus population at home was explained anew by Sir Frederick Napier Broome in an interesting lecture read (March 10) before the Royal Colonial Institute on Western Australia. A scheme of expansion was unfolded by which thousands of acres of fertile lands would be opened up by a proposed railway, and an invitation virtually given to British colonists to turn their steps thither. Such schemes as these, possible in most of our colonies, are of extreme practical interest to those who wish to see the resources of our empire utilised to the full for the benefit of Britons residing within the limits of the empire. The presence of the Prince of Wales lent an unusual éclat to the meeting of the Institute, and proves once again with what rapidity all Britons are learning the importance and value of their colonial possessions. In the House of Lords, Lord Sidmouth lately raised a discussion on a colonial naval force, and Lord Northbrook in reply to a question answered "that officers in the Imperial service would willingly give their services to the colonists as training officers." It rests with the agents-general, with the consent of the various colonial

legislatures, to bring forward a definite scheme. On this subject Sir Saul Samuel has remarked, "I think it would be a good thing if the Admiralty would take charge of all the small fleets of the colonies, each colony paying its quota of the expenses. This," he adds, "would be a step towards federation, a link that would bind the colonies closer to the mother-country than any other scheme he knew of." The spectacle of the comradeship in arms now afforded at Suakin by the presence of the New South Wales contingent standing shoulder to shoulder with Imperial troops is an encouraging one, and justifies the hope that what has been done with one branch of the service may be done with the other. Throughout the world British soldiers and sailors, whether recruited at home or in the colonies, may prove that they are ready to defend their legitimate rights, withstand injustice, and crush rebellion.

With regard to the Soudan itself, Mr. Stanley, who has been so successfully engaged in colonising projects of vast moment in equatorial Africa, contributes a letter to the *Times*, and advocates strongly the opening up of this part of the world by means of a permanent railway from Suakin to Berber. He observes that the Soudan is not worth a penny without a railway any more than the basin of the Upper Congo; and of the railway itself he adds, "Give it at least a five years' trial, and if no genius arises of English blood to rule the Soudan with the white wand of peace, lift up your rails off the track and begone, and seal it for the silence of ages, holding Suakin and Assouan only."

The situation in Bechuanaland is particularly puzzling, and presents us with the complexities of more than a triangular duel. Besides the Imperial Government we have to consider the Transvaal, Cape Colony, Free State, the two mock republics of Land Goshen and Stellaland, each with separate and apparently conflicting interests of their own. It is a relief to learn that military law rules in this distracted and disputed country, and that the British commander has arrested a Mr. Van Niekerk, a Stellaland official, on a charge of murder, thus striking at once at the rotten travesty of government too long allowed to exist by the British Government. The British forces are collected at Vryburg, the chief town in Stellaland, and have been organised with great celerity, striking fear into the hearts of the lawless adventurers. Within two months a thousand men have been advanced to a position eight hundred miles from Cape Town, and as they consist largely of mounted men they are easily mobilised and centred quickly where necessary. An interview has taken place between Sir Charles Warren and Mr. Kruger, the Transvaal representative, and the latter may be said to have given way on all points. In fact the Transvaalers have no case at all. On the contrary, they can be convicted of flagrant complicity in lawless acts. We must keep the main issue perfectly

clear before us, and the plain language of our administrator to Mr. Kruger when he said, "I do not know what you mean by the government" (of the mock republic); "I only know of a band of robbers who call themselves administrators of a country belonging to the Queen," helps us materially in understanding the situation. Some time ago Sir Hercules Robinson was equally explicit in describing the shameless audacity of the Transvaal Government when they wished to include the country of the Bechuanas under the terms of the Convention of 1884, after having illegally connived at plunder and rapine there. He wrote: "If the British Government were to amend the Convention in consequence of the unprincipled action of the freebooters, which the Transvaal Government have taken no pains to prevent, we should be making ourselves consenting parties to the grievous wrong which has been inflicted on our allies Montsiosa and Mankoroane, and offer an encouragement to the recurrence of such disgraceful proceedings in the future. Once let it be seen that Transvaal subjects can, unchecked by their own Government, plunder the natives across the Transvaal border of their lands, and, having done so, can then secure by annexation saleable titles for their stolen farms as well as the other advantages of a settled form of government, freebooting will become a trade and a precedent, the effect of which will not be limited to the four Bechuanaland chiefs whose cases are now under consideration." About the facts of criminal iniquity on the part of the freebooters, as well as of the culpable indifference of the Transvaal Government, there is no doubt, and it is extraordinary that both of them should find an apologist in the person of the Cape Premier, who, with a certain amount of legal sophistry, adopts the apparently congenial rôle of a special pleader before a Cape audience, at Stellenbosch, a Dutch village in the western province. He terms the unscrupulous borderers who hired themselves out to Moshette and Massouw, simply "mercenary soldiers," and excuses their action on the ground "that Englishmen long before now have utilised the services of mercenary soldiers." Such an argument would be only possible when expounded before a biased "Afrikander" audience.

These "mercenaries" were described in 1882 by a Captain Nourse, who was sent by Mr. Hudson, the British Resident in Pretoria, as "merely a number of loose men, who listened to no law, and were only seeking gain, such as cattle and ground, not caring from whom they got it." Captain Nourse saw the recruiting lists in the Transvaal, and was himself asked by an agent who did not know his position to join. The prize of the freebooters was a farm each and half the loot. Sir Hercules Robinson, who must be credited with the best possible knowledge of the circumstances of the case, observed, "that those men calling themselves Massouw's Volunteers, who

have taken service under one native chief with the object of appropriating the land and cattle of another native chief with whom they have no manner of quarrel, are committing a scandalous action, and bringing disgrace upon the European name in South Africa." The High Commissioner adds with emphasis, and quite rightly too, that he will not countenance such proceedings in any shape or form. The brutal murder of Mr. Bethell and Mr. Walker and the mutilation of their bodies were the last and crowning illustration of the customs of these "mercenary soldiers." Mr. Upington may be a skilful Irish barrister, but he can hardly explain away or soften down the brutal atrocities on the Transvaal frontier. It is satisfactory, therefore, to learn that Sir Charles Warren holds Bechuanaland with a strong military force, and has cleared the country for the present. He is taking into consideration certain land claims, and will bring the strictest and most impartial judgment to bear upon them. It is possible that the present possessors of farms may not be the freebooters themselves, but land-jobbers who have bought them from the freebooters; but this consideration does not make the claims just. The title is essentially bad, and the method of procuring it worse. Moreover, it is doubtful whether, according to Kafir law, Kafir chiefs can alienate their land at all without the consent of chiefs in council. The recent rupture between Sir Charles Warren and Mr. Rhodes, a Cape official, points to the fact that the presence of Cape politicians altogether complicates the situation. They seem to feel bound to consider at every turn the "Dutch" vote in the colony. The whole Bechuanaland question lies between the Transvaal and the Home Government. The treaty which was broken was that entered into between the British statesmen and Transvaal delegates, with which the Cape has had nothing to do. Why, therefore, cannot the question be settled between the two original contracting parties?

The British Government may say that the final adjustment of these Bechuanaland difficulties affects the Cape more than themselves. Ultimately it may, but at present there is so much intrigue going on in South Africa, such bitterness and prejudice, such class hatred, that it seems as well if England were to hold with a firm hand, for a time at least, the chief strategic and commercial positions. Bechuanaland is a territory which it is most essential to keep neutral and free from disturbances. It would be a bold and intelligible policy if the whole of it were taken under British protection, from the borders of the Cape Colony as far as latitude 22° north; even if the present disturbances blow over freebooters may renew their attacks farther north, and threaten Kolobeng as they now do Kuruman. The railway is gradually being extended, has nearly reached Kimberley, and

within a few years it may be extended to Secheli's country, who, by the way, has recently asked for British protection, so a permanent force, which seems necessary in these regions, will be easily kept and mobilised. The quickness of our movements on the present expedition has surprised the Transvaalers. As in the Soudan so in Bechuanaland a railway is necessary and useful from every point of view, strategic or commercial. It is the right time for England to declare a policy in South Africa. Sir Charles Warren has at his command seven or eight thousand troops, and the cost of the expedition will probably exceed £2,000,000. If he returns from Bechuanaland with the meagre boast of having cleared the country and put down disorder for a time only, the British taxpayer will vote the expedition a costly and profitless one. Bechuanaland must be held with a British force for some time until the state of South Africa generally is more peaceful. No large number of troops are required, as a few smart and well-mounted policemen can nip disorder in the bud and check the lawlessness of small bands of adventurers.

There can be no urgent need of handing over Bechuanaland to the Cape, with its quarrelling and contentious political parties, each trying to thwart the other, and frequently demeaning themselves by making capital out of the native question. Why should the Cape be enamoured of annexation? Recently it has thrown back the responsibility of governing Basutoland upon the Imperial Government, and was more than half inclined to abandon the Transkei. As things stand now, the Transkei territories are quite enough for the Cape Government to administer. In the future, the South Africans of every State, Dutch or British, may be trusted with the full task of governing South Africa, but they are not ready for it yet. Political education of every description is a growth, and the problem of governing native territories is a political education in itself, therefore it is unwise to saddle the Cape colonists, numbering 340,000, with the task of governing not only the million natives in the colony and the Transkei, but the Bechuanas also.

Unfortunately, the distinctions of right and wrong have been obscured just at present in South Africa by race animosities, and Transvaalers sympathise with freebooters because they fancy the quarrel is really one not for the possession of the barren wastes of Bechuanaland, but for the supremacy of South Africa. Cannot Sir Charles Warren, before he leaves the country finally, settle this question? If it is not settled now it will come up again at some future time, when England, after having been indifferent and careless, is aroused by fresh tales of lawlessness and atrocity. An intelligible policy, as hinted above, would be to take Bechuanaland under direct Imperial control as far as latitude 22° north, and include on the western border part of the Kalihari desert eastward of longitude 20°

cast. The expense of governing and holding it for a term of years would be trifling compared with the periodical vast expenditure we always seem called upon to make in South Africa. And the retention of this tract of country would mean that England was determined to have a policy or programme in South Africa. The proximity of the Diamond Fields—composed chiefly of the most loyal British subjects in Africa—would be an additional reason for a bold and independent line of action. From the Diamond Fields at all times might be expected not only moral sympathy, but at a pinch, material help. Although incorporated in the Cape Colony, Griqualand West has a distinct life and history of its own, and is pre-eminently rich and loyal. Boerdom has little influence here.

Next to Bechuanaland the Transvaal territories call for our interference. The Boers have gradually monopolised Zulu territory, Germans are intriguing and may still be intriguing along the Zulu littoral. Our Colonial Office has been more criminally apathetic in Zululand than anywhere else. Cannot some amends be made here, and the case of the Zulus be looked upon as carefully as that of the Bechuanas? The Transvaal Boers have recently obtained three million acres of land there, and there is no conceivable reason for this land hunger. The area of the Transvaal is 115,000 square miles, the population is about 40,000 or thereabouts, and the Boers can scarcely be said to be jostling one another here. Moreover, there is a vast amount of mineral wealth, especially gold, in the Transvaal, and the slightest industry of the burghers might be attended with immense success if they confined themselves within the boundaries of the Vaal River and the Drakensburg. Moreover, our moral obligations towards the Zulu nation have been and still are great. Too long have we allowed the land to lie at the mercy of intriguers and marauders of every description, and a rectification of our boundaries in south-east Africa, as well as a scheme of governing Zululand for the good of the Zulus, might worthily engage Sir Charles Warren's attention.

There is unrest and even intertribal fighting in Basutoland, where the well-known chieftains, Letsia, Lerothodi, and Masupha, rule refractory subjects in a precarious fashion of their own. Something might be done in this country to aid Colonel Clarke and overawe the Basutos, who have proved themselves incapable of understanding the subtle magic of moral force. Upon the whole there is a good deal for Sir Charles Warren to do, if he is allowed to do it, in Bechuana land, Basutoland, Pondoland, and Zululand. As he is at the head of a costly expedition, it would be a pity were he to return with a bare handful of meagre results.

PEACE OR WAR.

THE issues of peace and war may perhaps be decided before this article is in print. The army reserves and the militia have been called out and the navy is preparing for sea; the moderate demands of the English Cabinet that Russia shall evacuate Afghan territory or submit the question of the ownership of the disputed districts to the joint commission have been rejected; and by way of reply Russian armies are marching from Bokhara and the Caucasus. A lengthy discussion of the chances of the struggle would be premature. If war be the outcome of the situation the discussion can only be decided by cannons and breechloaders on the Danube and the Helmund. If a peaceful solution be found, as I still believe will be the case, the details of the new boundary line must be settled by the two Governments after consideration of the reports of the joint commission. All that can now with advantage be done is to give a general idea of the situation as it affects India, its princes and its people; and to explain the general policy which should govern the question of the northern boundary of Afghanistan, whether the present dispute end in peace or war. In these remarks I would desire to be distinctly understood to be expressing my personal opinions alone, and in no way those of the Government, of whose present policy and views I have no knowledge.

I would first observe that the critical condition of affairs on the Afghan frontier can surprise no one who has followed with reasonable care the course of events in Central Asia during the past few years. It was an understood thing that, in spite of promises made by the Russian Government and confirmed by the voice of the Emperor himself, Russia would seize Merv. The annexation of this place led as inevitably to the occupation of Sarakhs; and the consequences which have followed, with war imminent between England and Russia, were precisely predicted by General Sir Edward Hamley in a lecture at the Royal United Service Institution in May last, and in a letter of mine to the *Times* on the 24th of that month, the views of which were accepted by that journal and by

almost the entire provincial press of England. That has now come which we and many others anticipated and foretold, and there is little doubt but that the English Cabinet have seen as clearly what would happen. Their position has been a particularly inconvenient and invidious one, and they should rejoice that the audacity of the St. Petersburg claims and the rapacity of its diplomacy have given them that strong and dominant position with regard to the Russian advance which, without this startling proof of Russian duplicity, they could not have hoped to obtain. When a friendly Government offers assurances of the most solemn and distinct character, it is impossible for a Ministry conducted in accordance with the ordinary rules of diplomacy and self-respect to decline to accept them, even though they be transparently false. The Ministry knew well that Merv must fall into the hands of Russia, and they knew that Sarakhs would follow Merv. Against these annexations they had, as I have always held, no sound and valid ground of objection. Those districts had never been claimed by Afghanistan; they were beyond the limits of our political influence; and although their occupation by Russia might weaken our strategical position and threaten the northern boundary of Afghanistan, yet this could not be shown to be so directly the result as to justify on its account any breach of our friendly relations with Russia.

I observe that Lord Ripon, in a recent and most important speech at St. James's Hall to the members of the National Liberal Club, alluded to the evacuation of Kandahar, the recklessness of which had been bitterly criticised by Lord Salisbury, and observed that, "If the policy which had been persistently pursued by Her Majesty's Government in Afghanistan of carrying on, if possible, a strong, friendly, and independent Government in that country were the right policy, then he" (Lord Ripon) "said that nothing could be more fatal to the success of that policy, or the strong friendship of the Afghan ruler or people, than an occupation of Kandahar. If threatening occurrences should take place on the north-west frontier (which God forbid), we stood in a better position with respect to our relations with Afghanistan than we did, perhaps, at any previous period of our history."

These words represent with much fairness Lord Ripon's attitude with regard to Afghanistan; and supposing that it had been possible to consider Afghanistan as an isolated State, this policy might have been approved, for there would have been no reason to interfere with its internal development, and the Amir might well have been left undisturbed to work out his destiny and that of his country. But Afghanistan has no interest or importance for us apart from the advance of Russia. That advance has been as obvious and calculable as that of the hands of a clock; and those of us who have watched

hour succeed to hour will not accept as statesmanship that policy which was founded on the assumption that the clock had stopped. Before the discussion as to the policy of our retirement from Kandahar is obscured by war, it is only an act of justice to many of those who were in favour of that retirement to explain that we understood it in a different sense to Lord Ripon's interpretation. I was always in favour of the evacuation of Kandahar, for I believed that without it we should not secure the genuine friendship of the Amir. This was the most weighty reason which justified the retirement, and I cannot but think, with the late Viceroy, that the spectacle of Amir Abdur Rahman Khan meeting Lord Dufferin in friendly conference at Rawal Pindi is a sufficient justification of our withdrawal.* But that retirement did not, in itself, constitute a policy. It was, quite as much as the retention of Kandahar would have been, a defensive step against Russia, to secure the Afghan alliance at a future time; and it should have been followed by the formation at Quetta of a fortress of the first class, the construction of a broad-gauge railway through the Bolan if practicable, as I believe it to be, of strategic frontier railways, and of a military road from Peshawar to Sindh. Further, the demarcation of the Afghan boundary should have been arranged, both between Khoja Saleh and Sarakhs and also on the upper waters of the Oxus, which are, equally with the western districts, in dispute with Russia; and, in personal conference, the fragmentary and informal engagements with his highness the Amir should have been consolidated into a solemn treaty of offensive and defensive alliance, in which all favours and assistance received from us should have been the equivalent of concessions made by him. Nothing for nothing is the only maxim which should prevail in dealings with Afghans; and if they receive favours without having to yield an equivalent, they despise the giver and believe that he is afraid of them. So when, in June, 1883, Lord Ripon offered the Amir a subsidy of twelve lakhs a year to be devoted to the payment of his troops and to the measures required for the defence of his north-western frontier, it would have been well if that grant had been coupled with the demand for a telegraph line to Kabul and Kandahar, a British postal service for Government official papers between the British agent at Kabul and the Foreign Office, the immediate appointment of a Boundary Commission and the deputation of British engineer and artillery officers to Herat, not for permanent occupation, but to advise his Highness upon the fortifications of that important city, and to see their recommendations carried out. A subsidy without a certain and visible return is not to be commended in Oriental diplomacy; and it is beneath the dignity of a power like England to burden herself with obligations when she receives no compensating advantage.

So far as the outside world has been able to judge, there has been no definite policy with regard to Afghanistan since 1881 on the part of the Government of India, and the result has been what was always anticipated and foretold by Lord Napier of Magdala, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Sir Frederick Goldsmid, Sir Frederick Haines, Sir Edward Hamley, myself, and many others. The opportunity for satisfactorily settling the northern boundary, even should Russia now consent to a peaceful delimitation, has passed. We have lost our vantage ground; for, under any circumstances, we have to delimit with Russia as a party, and not by arrangement with Afghanistan alone. Before Russia occupied Merv she had no right to a voice on the subject of the northern boundary. These are matters of the past, and unless they were so I would not discuss them. Both in England and India a more bold and intelligent policy has been adopted, and the past apathy of the Indian Foreign Office may well be forgotten in the courageous and patriotic resolve of the Cabinet and of Lord Dufferin to resist the further advance of Russia.

It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the State visit which has been paid this week to the new Viceroy of India by the Amir of Afghanistan. Lord Dufferin has most wisely taken his first step in Indian foreign politics by affirming and cementing the friendly alliance of England and Afghanistan. A similar meeting might have been arranged with Lord Ripon any time during the last three years; for the Amir has always wished it, as he has desired the delimitation of his northern frontier, both of which points he pressed upon me when I first met him at Zimma, in July, 1880; but his visit at the present time has a special importance as contradicting the theories of those who objected to his selection for the throne of Kabul on the ground that he was a *protégé* of Russia, and that his sympathies were Russian. There can be little doubt that the Government of St. Petersburg have thought that, were they to make a forward move, the Amir, with whom they have long been attempting to intrigue, would throw in his lot with them. But one reason for the selection of Abdur Rahman Khan as Amir was the belief that his residence at Samarkand and Tashkend had made him too well acquainted with Russian policy to like or trust it. The Russians are often valuable friends to an exile or a pretender, but have not the same attractions for a ruling monarch who wishes to keep his own possessions. Moreover, Abdur Rahman, like every other Afghan, knew how Russia had tricked and betrayed the late Amir Sher Ali Khan, whom they fed with promises of armed assistance and then left to die of mortification, a fugitive on the banks of the Oxus.

There is a belief in the Punjab, founded on an intimate knowledge and accurate estimate of the Afghan character, that the Amir has only come to India to obtain all that he can in money and arms, and

that he will afterwards turn against us. Although my estimate of Afghan honesty is extremely low, and although I have only met two Afghans in my life whom I could trust, and probably they deceived me, yet treachery of the kind suggested is not worthy of serious discussion. It is true that the idea of any gratitude for our placing him on the throne has no place in the Amir's mind. He told me that he was perfectly aware that we only gave Afghanistan to him as a burden too heavy for our own shoulders. Enlightened self-interest and the instinct of self-preservation will alone secure the Afghan alliance. The Amir of Kabul must exist as the friend and feudatory of England or cease to exist at all; and there can be little doubt but that this essential dogma of the Indian political creed has been strongly pressed upon the attention of the Amir by the Viceroy during the present conference.

There is nothing more reassuring and striking than the zeal and even eagerness, with which the native princes of India have come forward to assist the Government and to strengthen its vigorous action by the most profuse and genuine offers of service. From all sides the most important ruling chiefs of India—the Nizam, Maharajas Sindhia, Holkar, and Kashmir, the Begum of Bhopal, the Maharajas of Patiala, Jhind, and Nabha, the chiefs of Central India and Rajputana—have all expressed their devotion to the Queen-Empress and their willingness to assist the Government with troops and money. There is no doubt of the personal loyalty of the feudatories of the Queen, or of their anxiety to stand before the world as her devoted subjects. Nor are their offers intended to be confined to words, for the chiefs would heartily welcome the call to furnish contingents for active service, which in the event of war with Russia would doubtless be made upon them by the Government of India.

The question of peace or war is awaited to-day in India with composure. In Lord Dufferin the country recognises that it has obtained a firm, wise, and strong ruler, who will steer its fortunes safely, however fierce may be the storm; and war with Russia is regarded rather with stern satisfaction than with anxiety or alarm.

If war be declared, the position of Russia in Central Asia and on the Caspian will give her a preliminary advantage on the Oxus and on the Persian frontier. I observe the special correspondent of the *Daily News* with the Afghan Frontier Commission observes that a disquieting element in connection with the position which Russia has acquired in Central Asia is the new Trans-Caspian railway, which would allow Russia to make a sudden move on Herat before our troops could arrive from India to defend it. But the fact is that to-day, and probably for all time, Russia, with her vast standing armies and complete military organization, will be always stronger than ourselves in the neighbourhood of Herat, and it would be to court disaster for

our armies to advance so far from their base in India. But supposing that there was not time to fortify Herat so as to make it secure against Russian attack, there is no reason to feel special anxiety on that account. All that England could ever hope would be to so strengthen Herat as to make it secure against a *coup de main*. If Russia, counting the cost, determines upon war with England in Europe and Asia, then the capture or the non-capture of Herat by Russia during the first operations of the war is a matter of very small importance. Our strong natural position would then be the occupation in force and the fortification of Kandahar, with the consent of the Amir; with the fortified lines of Quetta held by an imposing army in the rear. The hold of Russia on Herat would be loosened by operations on the Danube, in Armenia, in the Black Sea, and the Baltic. In the same way, Russia would probably at once occupy the province of Afghan Turkestan to the south of the Oxus, and would seize and hold possession of the whole country up to the Hindu Khush. We have no means to prevent such an invasion, which would probably be unresisted by the governor of the province, Sirdar Muhamad Izâk Khan, cousin of the Amir, but to whom he has always rendered a very doubtful obedience. He is ambitious of independence, and has wisely refused to pay his respects at Kabul, from which he knows well he would never return; for over the gates of that city the suspected friends of the Amir have always seen inscribed *Vestigia nulla retrorsum*. Should the Russians invade Afghan Turkestan, the British army would probably again occupy Kabul, holding strongly Bâmian and the two passes which are alone practicable for troops.

Speculation as to the events which would follow a declaration of war may, however, for the present be put aside. I cannot but believe, although England has fully prepared for war and 60,000 men are under arms for the Afghan frontier, that peace will still be maintained. Russia is unprepared and does not wish to fight yet. The one element of uncertainty is the incendiary and revolutionary spirit in Russia, which may, unseen by the outside world, have attained such alarming proportions, that war has become a necessity to the dynasty to divert the attention of the nation from its domestic grievances.

In the event of Russia receding from her demands and consenting to the settlement of the questions in dispute by the meeting of the Boundary Commissioners of the two Governments, it must not be forgotten that our status on that frontier is far stronger than before. We have gained a point of supreme importance in demonstrating to the world the clear and fixed determination of the English people to resist, at the cost of war, any encroachment by Russia upon territory belonging to a feudatory of the Queen. The bad faith of Russia has

at last been brought home to the intelligence of the people, and the time for discussing obscure ethnological and ethnographical questions with Russia as to the boundary of Afghanistan has properly ended. We must now insist upon such a boundary as will absolutely secure all roads and passes to Herat in the possession of the Amir, and Herat itself should be fortified under the direction of English engineer officers and, if necessary, at the cost of England, while a staff of such officers should, with a sufficient escort, reside there permanently. I should myself prefer to see the British Commission now withdrawn. All necessary information has been collected by them to enable the Government to decide the question, and their meeting Russian Commissioners could now signify no more than disputes on points on which England had made up her mind. There are no members of the Boundary Commission sent from India of any diplomatic experience or ability, and they will hardly meet Russian experts on equal terms.

With regard to the line of delimitation, I doubt if it be possible to fix a satisfactory boundary, by known mountain ranges or landmarks, which would not throw far too much Afghan territory into the hands of Russia. The Russian idea of a suitable boundary has been familiar to us all for some time, and, indeed, since the conclusion of the surveys of Lessar in 1882. It is probable that the line which was provisionally agreed upon in 1873 from Khoja Saleh to Sarakhs gives the most approximately convenient boundary, and to allow it to be brought southward to the mountain ranges, either in the direction of Herat or south of Andkhai, would give Russia command of many strategic positions to which she has no claim, and which we are now refusing her at the risk of war. No Commissioners should be allowed to weakly surrender to Russia by agreement what to-day we are ready to dispute by force of arms. Ethnological considerations are merely urged as a shield for fraud and aggression, and should be resolutely put aside. They are incapable of exact proof, and would only give rise to constant quarrel. M. Lessar, speaking at the Westminster Debating Society on the 23rd February, stated that the old boundary line left the Sarik Turkomans nothing but sand and desert, and urged that the lands capable of affording pasturage and the Salt Lakes, which the line Russia now proposed would include, were absolute necessities to them. But it is certain that these Turkomans have no real, permanent, and cultivating occupation of the fertile country of Badghis, between the rivers Murghab and the Hari Rud, and there would appear no insuperable difficulty in allowing them to use both the pasturage and the Salt Lakes if they are now accustomed to do so. At the same time, the Amir, if he be wise, can have no desire to retain these wild nomad tribes as his subjects, for he cannot influence or reclaim them; and

he should willingly allow them to retire into Russian territory. Should they remain Afghan subjects, they will undoubtedly give trouble.

However, the solution of the difficulty is not by annexing to Russia Afghan districts over portions of which nomad tribes have been accustomed at certain seasons of the year to wander in search of pasturage, but by removing these nomad settlements altogether beyond the Afghan boundary line. This would be no hardship, for one Turkoman tribe is always ousting another. The exceeding benevolence of M. Lessar's plea for the Turkoman pasturage and Salt Lakes is but an excuse to secure the passes and roads that dominate Herat.

Russia has taken possession of certain points which have undoubtedly long been held as Afghan territory, including Punjeh, Pul-i-Khisti, Ak Robat, and the Zulfakar Pass. We are under distinct engagement to the Amir to protect his territory against attack or encroachment, and the time has come when we have to redeem our pledge. No power which desires to maintain its position in the front rank could afford to disregard a breach of international right so flagrant as that which has now been committed by Russia; and all Englishmen rejoice to find that the heart of the country is still sound, and that all parties are willing to bury their political disputes and to support a bold national policy. India, against whom the attack is ultimately directed, awaits it without anxiety, and is eager and ready to do her fair share in driving back this new invasion of the barbarians. It is felt here that war is preferable to peace, unless peace be accompanied by conditions which may assure its permanence. We do not desire a peace which only signifies the retreat of Russia from an untenable position until she is better prepared and we are less so. We prefer war to the surrender by commissioners or secretaries of positions which the English people are bound in honour to maintain, and which cannot be abandoned without national disgrace. No concession should be made to Russia, and no single square mile which can be shown on sufficient evidence to have been in Afghan possession should be resigned. I will end this article with a quotation from my letter in the *Times* a year ago, which Englishmen must understand is still the point at issue:—

“The forward movement of Russia on the Persian and Afghan frontier has brought her into a position when her next step must bring her into collision with England, and the Power which then recedes before the other must from that day take the second place in Europe and Asia. I do not believe that Englishmen will endure that this position of inferiority shall be taken by England.”

LEPEL GRIFFIN

MR. SWINBURNE'S POETRY.

THE strong side of a nation's character, some French critic has observed, is often the weak side of its poetry. The remark has essential justice, though in a perverted form; for the truth would seem to be, that when the strong side of national character is not represented in its poetic art, then we may be sure that such poetry as may be produced is not conspicuously national. On the other hand, it is very rare that there is such complete accordance between character and artistic product as can assure us that the one is the effect of which the other is the cause. Whenever such union is realised there is what the Germans call a genuine art-epoch. History teaches us that such periods are short-lived, and whatever causes philosophers of æsthetics may assign, one thing is clear, that it is only in times of greatly superabundant energy that the national forces issue in artistic creation. The sudden brilliance of Greek art, the capricious activities of mediæval Italy, the glow and glory of Elizabethan literature, all tell the same tale. When art is recommended or defended "for art's sake," there is the beginning of the end. If it be not the spontaneous overflow of a restless power, which neither asks the reason of its exercise, nor craves the acknowledgment of a specific end, then it may be "precious," or "thankworthy," or "divine;" it may exhaust all the adjectives of an enthusiast's vocabulary, except that it is not national.

The modern poetry of England has a curiously artificial air when judged by this standard: Once, and once only, in the history of English literature was a strongly-marked national character wedded with a perfect artistic expression. The bride was the drama: she had as wedding guests men like Raleigh, Sidney, Bacon, and Essex; while the high-priests and grooms of the marriage ceremony were Marlow and Shakespeare, Jonson and Fletcher, Webster and Ford. In a modern day the leading poets have characteristics which, so far from being representatively English, are in reality alien and exotic. Nowhere do the forensic and rhetorical tendencies of Englishmen, their measured activities, their unmeasured emotions, the majestic poise and balance of their diction, the illimitable wealth of their language find better artistic expression than in the drama. But our modern poets are not conspicuously successful in drama. The strong side of modern English life is its science, its practicalness, its sanity. But the poets are not run in this mould; they are over-thoughtful, as Browning—a gift or defect which is not English but German; they are over-refined and pretty, as Tennyson—a characteristic which

he shares with the Italians; they are over-sensuous, as Swinburne not in this instance alone reminding us of his French models. It is not in any spirit of disrespect that such judgment is passed. One can but judge a literature by its own highest realisation in history, and if such standard makes us speak lightly of honoured names, the fault is not ours nor theirs, but the solitary and cruel pre-eminence of Shakespeare.

Poetic art has possibly other functions than to be national. It is above all things cosmopolitan and catholic. And even though its more modern forms may hardly lay claim to such vague though unlimited empire, they may at least make apology that no art can be representative of materialism. In this our modern poets are undoubtedly right. A few years ago the attempt to make science speak the language of common human emotion and feeling was made in her later novels by George Eliot. A more definite effort to idealise the philosophy of Herbert Spencer in rhythmical verse, to find the poetic equivalents for "environment" and "social medium," and "change from homogeneity to heterogeneity," bore the name of that talented agnostic, Miss Bevington. Such efforts are not supremely happy, and so far as materialism has conquered or is conquering the national tone and temper, poets are right to disregard the current philosophy and abandon themselves to their own fine careless rapture. But there are certain rigid tests to which the creations of every artist become liable, even though the touchstone of ready correspondence with social medium be abandoned. Is the thought of the artist independent of language and expression? If not, he may be full of musical voices, but he is a singer and not a poet. Is he a master builder? Is his genius original, creative, architectonic? If not, whatever may be his individual brilliancies, however rich may be his decorative imagery, he remains only an amateur, not an artist. Of the three poets recently named, there is no doubt that Browning, by his profound thoughtfulness, and Tennyson, by his lyrical sweetness, have won their way to an acknowledged eminence. The question, however, may be held to be still open with regard to the third. The announcement that a new poem from his prolific pen is on the verge of publication affords a convenient opportunity for the attempt to see in what relation Mr. Swinburne stands to such tests as have been mentioned.

There is much in the development of Mr. Swinburne's genius which throws light upon the position which he holds amongst his contemporaries. His earliest work was published in 1861, containing two plays, *The Queen Mother* and *Rosamond*, both of which bear obvious traces of juvenile immaturity. Neither of them, however, are without interest, from the evidence they furnish of early poetic influences. In *Rosamond* there are touches here and there of Browning, whose

peculiar characteristics are singularly alien to the more mature stage of Swinburne, but still leave marks of their power in that most discerning criticism on Browning which is to be found in the opening pages of the much later study on Chapman. Bouchard, for instance, in the play often talks the language of Browning, and single lines occur which, transplanted from their context, would never be supposed to belong to Swinburne.

"So his tooth
Bites hard in France and strikes the brown grape hot,
Makes the wine leap, no skin-room leaves for white."

"Beaten and blown i' the dusty face of the air."

"Being no such sinewed ape,
Blunder of brawn, and jolted muscle-work."

Such expressions convey the distinct flavour of Browning's verse. *The Queen Mother*, on the other hand, is formed on a different model. It is by no means a successful drama, some of the incidents—for instance, the scene in which Catherine poisons her clown—being brought into harsh and unnecessary relief. But here and there the style is copied from Shakespeare.

"The sea's yellow and distempered foam."

"Towers and popular streets
Should in the middle green smother and drown,
And havoc die with fulness."

"She is all white to the dead hair, who was
So full of gracious rose the air took colour,
Turned to a kiss against her face."—

Lines such as these have more than a distant echo of Elizabethan verse. In this stage the poet, it is clear, is only looking for such models as might satisfy his aspiration, and making those preliminary essays, without which the yet-undeveloped wings cannot learn to soar in their own proper air. Then came the happy inspiration, born of a long training in classical languages, which produced a Greek play worthy to rank with the most successful specimens of this kind of work in our literature. For there is hardly anything like *Atalanta in Calydon* in our modern verse. Its hard, clear outline, like that of some Greek temple in the pure Attic sky; its wonderful richness and variety of music, together with its strong grasp of the central situation of Hellenic tragedy,—the irony of a human being in the toils of a relentless fate; its rhymed choruses, combining the melodiousness of modern verse, with the reticent music of the Dorian lyre—all these characteristics make *Atalanta in Calydon* an unique and almost faultless work of art. The third venture was of a different kind. If we omit for the present *Chastelard*, to which we shall return later, two years after *Atalanta*, in 1866, Mr. Swinburne published the notorious

Poems and Ballads. The volume produced a keen literary warfare between the poet's champions and detractors. Mr. W. M. Rossetti was the author of a criticism on the book: and finally Mr. Swinburne himself in certain *Notes* felt obliged to protect his own offspring against the maledictions of outraged propriety.

Even thus early there are supplied for the critic's guidance important data in forming an estimate of Mr. Swinburne. Two points have been placed in clear and conspicuous relief—the linguistic skill and the sensualistic interest. *Atalanta in Calydon* is only one evidence out of many of Mr. Swinburne's extraordinary proficiency in languages not his own. The instinct which enables a man to transplant himself into conditions of thought and existence, which are not those into which he has been born, has its drawbacks as well as its advantages. To Mr. Swinburne nothing seems to have been so easy as to feel, so to speak, in another language. He was, it would appear, a natural scholar, and the Greek tongue which he could bend so easily to purposes of his own, was the sister of that modern French poetry whose turns and phrases from Ronsard down to Victor Hugo he has so exhaustively explored. But a training in languages gives rather facility of expression than the penetrative insight of thought. The fatal ease with which the ideas of another age and another country are acquired, however much it may improve style and chasten expression, leaves the student without the power of appreciating or interpreting the insistent problems which vex the soul of his contemporaries. It is the weakness of classicism that it yields no philosophy of life; and if the student be brought to say his word to his own age, it either wears a curiously old-world air, or else is couched in the language of frivolous cynicism. To such a man there is no such thing as modern thought. He has the trick of the old manner which knows nothing of modern burdens, or else he turns in daily practice to epicurean principles. For there is nothing in the ancient thought which can help the modern inquirer in his struggle to keep alive the soul of man amidst the imposing mechanisms of science, and if it suggests a philosophy, it is only the contemptuous advice to get the full sensational equivalent out of each minute as it flies. In Mr. Swinburne, at all events, the alternative takes a clearly accentuated form: linguistic culture on the one hand, a culture which makes the verses throb with the fire and fervour of the Hellenic spirit; and for practical moral in daily life nothing but the undisguised sensualism of *Poems and Ballads*.

It is not right perhaps to condemn with such a short and easy method the Cyrenaic mood of *Poems and Ballads*. Certainly it is not intended to deny their poetic graces. The sumptuous imagery, the affluence and variety of music, the curious felicities of diction remain unimpaired, however much the spirit may be criticised. But Mr. Swin-

burne must not be judged as a lesser poet might be, in whose case we might thankfully acknowledge the brilliancy of style and fervour of poetic flow. In his case the severer canons of criticism have to be applied as to one who in mould and stature claims to be in the first rank of poetry. We desire to know whether he is an artist or a stylist, a poet or an amateur. Shall we say that with him the expression is sought for its own sake; or shall we say that he is in the true sense original and creative? The criterion, so far at all events, is easy, for if he be veritably creative he can be so, not in virtue of certain powers of wearing the garment of his poetic forefathers, nor in virtue of a musical utterance which can make our rhetorical mother tongue sing with all the airs and graces of southern languor; but either because he has grappled directly and sincerely with thoughts which are lifted above the common level of our ordinary intellectual moods, or because he has interpreted with more passionate intensity the experience of the men and women of our contemporary age.

It is quite clear that Mr. Swinburne is not, at all events in his earlier work, a philosopher. No such excuse can be given for *Poems and Ballads* as that we are here presented with a sensationalism which is the natural and inevitable outcome of a particular theory of the world, as a phantasmagoria of passing effects. History, it is true, gives us a sensationalism so based in the doctrines of Aristippus the Cyrenaic, as modelled on a Heracleitean doctrine of universal flux; and Mr. Pater in his recent book has once again revealed the dependence of his peculiar æsthetic theories on an avowed acceptance of the dogmatic standpoint of the old Ephesian thinker. But if sensationalism be not founded on a philosophic theory, it must be defended as a loyal acknowledgment of concrete facts of experience, as the unimpaired reflection of the simplest data which go to form both our beliefs and our practice. Can, however, Mr. Swinburne's sensationalism be accounted for on such a ground? Is it experience, or morbid fancy, that dictates such poems as those on an extinct type of Roman lust, or a love fragment of Sappho, or on the statue of the Hermaphrodite in the Louvre? If nothing else stood in the way, at least the strained and artificial expression would serve to show that we have here not the creative melody of one who, like Shelley, was nourished on musical thoughts, but rather the recondite ravings of an artificer of impotent emotions.

Will it be said that the connection thus traced between such different studies as *Atalanta* and *Poems and Ballads* is forced and arbitrary? It can be so only if we forget the principles of a deeper criticism. Its task should be to exhibit all the different phases of activity as they spring from one common soil, to retrace the various branches of artistic workmanship to the single root of the artist's own personality. The problem which the early years of Mr. Swinburne

present us with is the contrast between classical studies (wherein should be, as we think, all the calm dignity and confident repose of Greek *Sôphrosyne*) and the perfervid glow and hurry of sensual imagination. One suggested solution is the fact that studies in the antique afford a poor discipline in life problems; another might be the real absurdity of the attempt to write Greek plays in a modern tongue. Take the acknowledged successes in this department of literature: Matthew Arnold's *Merope*, Goethe's *Iphigeneia at Tauris*, Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, Mr. Swinburne's *Atalanta in Calydon*. Keats' *Hyperion* being only a fine torso hardly comes into the question, and Mr. Bridges' *Prometheus the Fire Giver*, has not yet attained the dignity of a classic. Arnold's *Merope*, however, full of classical grace and insight, is stricken with the mortal palsy of dulness. Goethe's *Iphigeneia* is only as good as Euripides' play on the same subject, because it is modern in conception, and deals with essentially modern problems in ethics; dramatically, especially in the *ἀναγνώρισις* between Iphigeneia and Orestes, it is immeasurably inferior. Milton's *Samson Agonistes* is successful, according to the unanimous verdict of competent critics, but why? Because it is *not* a transcript from the Greek, but while the treatment is Greek, it takes its subject from a cycle of legendary history which stands in the same relation to Milton's readers as the heroic myths stood to a Greek audience. What is the fault of Mr. Swinburne's *Atalanta*? However perfect in execution and flawless in workmanship, however musical in its range of poetic voices and rhythms, however full of the old Greek idea of resistless destiny, it has a defect whether viewed from the ancient or the modern side. From the modern standpoint it fails because it is too remote from that sum of common interests and difficulties which it is alike the task and the privilege of modern poets to interpret; and from the ancient standpoint, it fails, because it connects the powerlessness of man before destiny, not with reverential submission and quiet self-restraint, but with a noisy intolerance and an almost frantic atheism. When the poet has not before him a Greek model, on what line of thoughts is his poetical contemplation to run? The charm of the Hellenic world being for him its æsthetic fascination, and not its essential spirit of sobriety, moderation, and self-control, the poet throws the reins on the neck of a fiery imagination; the sage remark of Socrates in the Republic—that the true love must have no taint of vice or madness—will soon be forgotten; æsthesis will lead to acrasia, and art will pander to incontinence. And so the chaste Atalanta has for her unruly sisters Faustina Imperatrix, and "the splendid and sterile Dolores, our Lady of Pain."

The most decisive advance on the conceptions with which Swinburne was occupied in his earlier studies is found in two works bearing the dates of 1871 and 1874. In those years were produced

Songs before Sunrise and the tragedy of *Bothwell*, the first being a glorification of the principles of Pantheism and Republicanism, and the second a serious dramatic study on lines not too far removed from contemporary interests. If the first of these works exhibits Swinburne as attempting to lay the foundations of a creed, the second is the best answer to that easy criticism which complained of the want of serious purpose and the absence of hard work in the writings of the poet. To estimate these works aright is a matter of considerable importance; for here, if anywhere, is to be found the high-water mark of Swinburne's genius, the most virile and statuesque productions which are associated with his name.

Songs before Sunrise is an interesting book from two points of view. In the first place it contains the speculative foundation for the reckless sensualism of *Poems and Ballads*, and in the second place it adopts a definite political programme in relation to the great revolutionary movements of modern society. Whether, however, in either of these aspects the book is a successful one is another matter. The psychology of Mr. Swinburne is very simple, so simple, indeed, that we are hardly prepared for the superabundant rhetoric with which he adorns so elementary a scheme. Appetite and desire are the only motive impulses of humanity. It is true that the human being is sometimes acted on by reason, by deference to established custom, by conscience. But these, we are told, are blind guides, because not only in themselves the pale and colourless reproductions of what in sensation is positive and definite, but also because they have been connected, as history shows, with all sorts of tyranny, superstition, and wrong. The simple human being, with primary desires and strong, ineradicable appetites, is the only version of humanity whom Mr. Swinburne would admire. Two elemental principles (whom the poet, as his custom is, envisages as goddesses) are provided for the adoration of true believers. One of these is Earth, "The ghost of God, the mother uncreated," whose connection with natural impulses is too obvious to require illustration. The other, in a highly mystical poem, is called "Hertha," and is apparently an embodiment of Heraclitus' doctrine of the identity of contraries, the old Ephesian philosopher here as elsewhere serving as the name to swear by, to all who espouse a sensationalistic creed. Such a restoration of the human being to his primitive and inalienable birthrights naturally involves the doctrine of freedom, a freedom which is very like the licence claimed by the animals in the Platonic version of Democracy, who refuse to get off the pavements in the streets, as a proof of the universal equality and brotherhood professed by the State. Freedom and liberty are indeed the watchwords of Mr. Swinburne's pyrotechnical triumphs. They blaze in the midst of a coruscation of rhetorical verbiage and metrical effects which it would be difficult to parallel in

any other English poetry. Curiously enough, the volume is dedicated to Mazzini, whose constant doctrine was that there could be no rights without duties. In Mr. Swinburne, however, freedom, the right to enjoy, appears to involve no duties, whether of self-denial or of self-perfection. At most there is the duty of self-realisation in the narrowest and most limited sense of the word self, which confines its activities to pleasure and passion. Nor is Swinburne's political propaganda less theatrical and meretricious. Here the sacred name of Shelley is invoked, as though his example consecrated all revolutions and every attempt to upset existing religions. Possibly no serious comparison with Shelley is intended; if it be, the issue is doubly disastrous to the younger poet. The conditions of the revolutionary programme, to begin with, are different. There is no longer any talk about the beheading of kings, or the downfall of dynasties, or the wild upheaval of chaotic disorder. Language of this sort strikes one as thrasonical and insane, for the modern revolutionary creed is confined to certain practical issues, especially the organization of labour against capital, and the confiscation of property. Shelley, too, was, of course, an atheist, but in attacking the prevalent superstitions of the world he is at once more graceful and more plain-spoken than the younger apostle. He would not, for instance, have employed biblical phraseology in an attack on the Bible, nor would he have made use of the Litanies of the Prayer Book in an assault upon all forms of worship. As a mere question of taste, Swinburne's poems entitled *Before a Crucifix*, *Blessed among Women*, and *The Hymn of Man* are as revolting as they are essentially ludicrous. No one, of course, desires to object to Mr. Swinburne's profession of Pantheism so long as it is reasonably argued and coherently deduced from logical principles, but a wild dithyramb in favour of Atheism, couched in terms which are actually borrowed from the books of Christianity, is neither rational, humorous, nor artistically tolerable. When Mr. Swinburne is content to be simply poetic, as in some of his apostrophes to Italy and to Greece, there let us accord him all the praise that is his due. But his so-called philosophical foundation is too narrow, too rhetorical, too full of feminine hysteria.

Fortunately, Mr. Swinburne has provided us with better materials for estimating his poetic maturity. The drama of *Bothwell* is the second in a noble trilogy on the character and fortunes of Mary Queen of Scots. If it be right to depreciate the value of Mr. Swinburne's ancient studies, the poet himself has testified to the greatness of the change which came over him when, after *Atalanta in Calydon*, he composed *Bothwell*. In two ways his advance is a conspicuous one. Not only do we get the more manly and catholic study involved in a change to drama from a subjective and not entirely healthy exercise of the erotic imagination, but, instead of the pale ghosts of the

Hellenic world, we have before us the substantial flesh and blood of those characters who, whether by their vices or their virtues, helped to build up the fabric of our nation. *Chastelard*, the first of the trilogy, belongs, indeed, to the earlier period. There is no firmness in the characterisation, no grasp of the dramatic elements of a situation: and the same insistence on the sensual and passionate aspects of love appears which is to be found in the juvenile drama of *Rosamond*. In *Bothwell*, however, a great deal of this is changed. Queen Mary is no longer exhibited as a baneful and criminal Eros luring men to destruction, but as herself brought under the subjection of a stronger will and a more brutal resolve. Moreover, there are so many traces in the drama of careful and conscientious use of authorities that we are almost dazed by the series of historic scenes and the introduction of countless historic personages. If the critic said in his haste that Mr. Swinburne was deficient in seriousness and study, with the drama of *Bothwell* before him he must recant his error. Nor can it be said that there is any want of clear and definite characterisation, at all events in the principal parts. The successive changes in Mary's character, from the time of the murder of Rizzio, through the domination of Bothwell and the complicity in the destruction of Darnley at Kirk-o'-field, down to the final surrender of herself to Elizabeth in view of a possible future revenge, are traced with a conscientious fidelity to nature which is the best gift of the dramatist. The character of Bothwell himself is clear in outline and consistent in details. His warlike prowess, his brutal frankness, his innate strength of resolve, his power of at once subduing the Queen of Scots and yet binding her to himself with stronger chains than she had ever worn in all her previous amours, throw the whole savage personality out in conspicuous relief from the multitude of subordinate characters. Moreover, there is good dramatic use of materials, witness the fine scene when Mary and Darnley have their last interview at Kirk o' Field. Here most of the incidents are historical, especially the terrible words of Mary: "'Twas just this time last year David was slain;" and Darnley's application to his own case of the words of the Psalmist, "the deadly Scripture," wherein he complains that it was not an open enemy that had done him this dishonour, but his own familiar friend with whom he had so often taken sweet counsel.

On the other hand, the drama suffers from all the inherent defects of so-called "literary" dramatic writing. It is much too long and diffuse, and too complicated in historic characters and historic detail. The list of *Dramatis Personæ* is enough to appal the stoutest heart; for sixty-three personages struggle and writhe on Mr. Swinburne's stage. Five hundred and thirty-two pages of close print are required to evolve the tragic incidents of the play; and after all, the fifth act is not properly the close of a completed dramatic evolution, but the

prelude for the *Mary Stuart* which enques. The fourth act is undoubtedly the best, for the reason especially that it includes the famous sermon of John Knox; but the third and second acts are very tedious, being devoid of that power of artistic selectiveness which enables a dramatist to concentrate his action on two or three salient points. The fifth act falls absolutely flat after the grandeur of the fourth, the only excuse being the necessary preparation of ground for the ensuing play. In these and other points, it may be regretted that Mr. Swinburne should not have attempted to write professedly for the stage, in which case he might have learnt that pregnant conciseness, both in incident and characterisation, without which no practical dramatist can win the ear of a busy and somewhat impatient audience.

Mary Stuart, the concluding part of the trilogy, is by no means so fine or so powerfully written as its predecessor, though it undoubtedly adds somewhat to the great dramatic and poetic achievement of its author, the discovery, namely, of the true character of the Queen of Scots. For here was a personality which, in its subtlety and weakness, essentially suited the forcible yet narrow capacities of Mr. Swinburne's poetic genius. *Mary Stuart* he may claim to have thoroughly understood, because the hysterical, passionate, subjective nature of that strange woman struck certain answering chords in her biographer's temperament—

" She shall be a world's wonder to all time,
A deadly glory watched of marvelling men,
Not without praise, not without noble tears,
And if without what she would never have,
Who had it never, pity,—yet from none
Quite without reverence and some kind of love
For that which was so royal." a

But it is to Mr. Swinburne's credit that he has almost made live before our eyes two other personalities with whom he has little or nothing in common—the brutal Bothwell and the puritanical Knox, both intense, arrogant, and impetuous forces, devoid possibly of spiritual interest, yet instinct with natural and imperious fire. And the character of Mary Beaton, though its importance is probably unhistorical, is full of interest, and has a noticeable influence on the development of the tragedy in serving as a link to connect the three dramas together. In such characterisations the dramatist must have his due.

A happy specimen of Mr. Swinburne's later manner is furnished by the Greek tragedy called *Erechtheus*, in many respects one of the most completely enjoyable poems which the author has produced. Full of musical sound, and furnished with many magnificent lines, *Erechtheus* is perhaps superior to *Atalanta* in that it has more breadth and stateliness of action, and exhibits a more perfectly Hel-

lenic repose. It has less sweetness but more majesty, and frantic declamation against the gods is conspicuously absent. What it loses in graceful juvenility it gains in maturity of grasp and virile self-control. The legend which Mr. Swinburne follows groups together the two events of Chthonia's sacrifice and Eumolpus' defeat as contemporaneous incidents, instead of exhibiting the immolation of the daughter as the recompense required by Poseidon for the death of his son. He is thus enabled to bring into prominence the character of Erechtheus's wife, Praxithea, who has on one and the same day to bear the loss of daughter and of husband, and yet, through her noble devotion to the cause of Athens, for whom no sacrifices are too costly, is still able to say with peaceful resignation, "I praise the gods for Athens." In other respects, Mr. Swinburne's arrangement leads to some awkwardness of construction. For two messengers have successively to present themselves, the first with tidings of how Chthonia met her death, "with light in all her face as of a bride;" and the second with the story of the great battle, in which Erechtheus drives his spear "through the red heart's root" of Eumolpus, and himself falls smitten by a "sheer shaft of lightning writhen." The intimate connection between the two events is left for the reader to surmise, where a clear statement of cause and effect might have led to a better dramatic development. But the chorus which divides the speeches of the two messengers is in Mr. Swinburne's finest style. The verse heaves and pants with the furious riot of the battle-scene which the Chorus are imagining, and eye and ear alike are dazed with the wonderful affluence of the diction:—

"From the roots of the hills to the plain's dim verge, and the dark, loud shore,
Air shudders with shrill spears crossing, and hurtling of wheels that roar.
As the grinding of teeth in the jaws of a lion that foam as they gnash,
Is the shriek of the axles that loosen, the shock of the poles that crash.
The dense manes darken and glitter, the mouths of the mad steeds champ,
Their heads flash blind through the battle, and death's foot rings in their tramp."

So the picture goes on for three pages, rich in wild hyperbole of effective imagery, as is Mr. Swinburne's wont. There appears to be something very congenial to the author's temperament in such a worship of "Mother Earth" as the autochthonous inhabitants of Attica professed. In reality Chthon is the divinity, who protects her children against the sea's offspring, Eumolpus, rather than the Athena, who appears, as Greek tragic custom demands, at the end of the play, when the "*dignus vindice nodus*" has been reached. To celestial gods the poet is disinclined to do homage; to the bountiful mother of all being, the material element from which things receive their frame, which contains in itself, as Professor Tyndall once declared, "the promise and potency of all terrestrial life"—to such a dark

negation of all spiritual force, Mr. Swinburne here, as elsewhere, pays his tribute of enthusiastic devotion. This is the link which connects the poet with an age of materialistic science. There remains, however, even in *Erechtheus*, that sense of unreality and fruitless ingenuity to which all such adaptations from the classics must, in the nature of things, be exposed. Here, for instance, are some lines put in the mouth of the blameless Chthonia, when she first appears on the scene ;—

- “Forth of the fine-spun folds of veils that hide
My virgin chamber toward the full-faced sun,
I set my foot not moved of mine own will,
Unmaidenlike, nor with unprompted speed
• Turn eyes too broad or dog-like unabashed——”

Faultlessly Greek, but absolutely fatuous. Did not Mr. Lowell once write an ingenious caricature of such Hellenism in a *στιχομυθία*, commencing, “Foolish who bites off nose, his face to spite?”

Mr. Swinburne's later contributions have not added much to the promise or the realisation of his poetic powers, albeit that his admirers are fond of bringing them in evidence that he has outlived the errors of his youth. Doubtless they are more restrained in expression ; they do not exhibit so much exuberance of emotional riot, while at the same time they prove that the musical gift has not waned with the passing years. “Boy poet” Mr. Swinburne can no longer claim to be, and our judgment must perforce be harder on anything which reminds us of juvenile rhodomontade and bombast. Yet if we ask what new ideas the years which bring the philosophic mind have contributed, what thoughts of clearer or deeper insight have enriched our common heritage, the answer reveals the infertility of the soil from which we expect a second harvest. Two subjects inspire all the later work of Mr. Swinburne—the sea and babies. The worship of the baby, as practised by its latest devotee, is not perhaps an inspiring spectacle. But the praise of the sea is even more significant, for it is nothing if not sensuous ; it is the conscious ecstasy of the wash of waves over the naked body of the swimmer, the delirium of solitary exposure to the blind fury of elemental strength. When a strong man, like Byron or Shakspeare, praises the sea, he describes it as its master. The poems of Mr. Swinburne on the same subject reveal the attitude of the slave, or rather the passionate, submissive joys of some creature of a tyrant's whims. Is there any later thought to be culled from his verse ? If so, possibly it may be found in the wonderful verses which exhibit his antagonism to the House of Lords in the *Midsummer Holiday*. But a caricaturist of Mr. Swinburne's versification could not possibly outdo in extravagance of diction these most characteristic odes. No parody or burlesque could do its subject such perfect justice.

Mr. Swinburne's prose criticisms in his *Essays and Studies* afford convenient material for a summary of the chief points in his literary character. That his prose style is a good one few would be prepared to admit; it has too much artificial and meretricious brilliancy. Nor is his critical instinct wholly trustworthy or admirable, for it is too petulant, and suggests too few ideas. There is a sentence in one of the essays which serves exactly to represent the ordinary reader's feelings in this matter. "We do not always want," says Mr. Swinburne, in unconscious self-criticism, "to bathe our spirit in overflowing waters or flaming fires of imagination: pathos, and passion, and aspiration, and desire are not the only springs we seek for song." Yet if we take the essays in hand, just as when we read the poems, we are always being bathed in overflowing waters and flaming fires. There is no repose of spirit, no beauty of calm, we never find ourselves saying it is good for us to be here. Sympathy is a precious quality for the critic, and the faculty for praise sometimes argues a richly endowed nature. Yet the constant use of superlatives in discussing poetic work does not help our judgment or impress our minds. Reading each essay by itself, we might suppose that Mr. Swinburne is in turn introducing us to the greatest poet of the age. Rossetti, Morris, Matthew Arnold, Coleridge, Shelley—each is the most magnificent artist that ever lived to confound the Philistine. It is true that Matthew Arnold, who has more sanity and less poetry than Mr. Swinburne, only affects him on his classical side, and not on that by which he has most influence on his generation; but that is explicable by antecedent considerations. Only Wordsworth, as the chosen poet of Philistinism, is left out in the cold. Even Byron gets bespattered with some frothy praise, though subsequently Mr. Swinburne has seen fit to qualify his judgments. But the most servile adulation is of course reserved for Victor Hugo, "the master," as he is usually styled, in whose presence Mr. Swinburne always takes the shoes from off his feet, and crawls in prostrate reverential awe. Within the limits of his Pantheon there is no such ecstatic worshipper as this most intolerant of atheists, for his nature is essentially yielding and receptive, with stormy gusts of passion and indiscriminating impulses of emotion. There is no strong masculine formative quality about him, which explains why he uses so many adjectives and suggests so few thoughts. Is there anything in the philosophy of *Songs before Sunrise* to compare with the long soliloquy of Empedocles in Matthew Arnold's poem? Is there any thoughtfulness of characterisation in his dramas which can be put by the side of Browning's *Djabal*, or *Anael*, or *Strafford*? Moreover, there is an entire absence of humour—a serious defect in any poet claiming to be intellectual. For clumsiness of irony it would be difficult to beat the pages (pp. 29, 30) in *Essays and Studies*, in which he comments

on the action of the Belgian Government towards Hugo. The power of satire depends largely on terseness, as wit depends on brevity, and Swinburne's periods are far too prolix to be effective. There remain the indubitably picturesque qualities of his style, the wealth and fluency of rhetoric, and the unique command of music. Sometimes the result is marred by alliterative tricks; at other times it is heightened by the graceful touches of classical culture. Here, for instance, on two successive pages of one of Mr. Swinburne's essays, are passages which illustrate this contrast. He is describing one of Hugo's heroines:—

"But now we have her from the hands of a poet as well as student, new blown and actual as a gathered flower, in warm bloom of blood and breath, clothed with live colour, fair with significant flesh, passionately palpable."

The force of tawdry alliteration could no farther go; but on the next page is a fine passage, instinct with the life and spirit of Greek tragic verse:—

"We seem to hear about her the beat and clash of the terrible timbrels, the music that Æschylus set to verse, the music that made mad, the upper notes of the psalm shrill and strong as a sea-wind, the 'bull-voiced' bellowing under-song of those dread choristers from somewhere out of sight, the tempest of tambourines giving back thunder to the thunder, the fury of Divine lust that thickened with human blood the hill-streams of Cithæron."

Perhaps some of Swinburne's best studies are on Elizabethan dramatists, John Ford, for instance, in *Essays and Studies*, or the criticism on George Chapman. It is in the latter that some of the most discriminating remarks occur which have perhaps ever been made on Browning. The obscurity which arises from wealth of ideas is most carefully distinguished from that which is due to confusion of thought, a distinction which ought to be always present to the student of our modern poet of enigmas. But the total impression left on us by Swinburne's prose is the same as that of his verse. Brilliantly gifted, profusely voluble, passionately rhetorical, it puts before us too often phrases instead of thoughts, verbal contortions instead of conceptions. It errs in point of taste, not rarely nor unwittingly. Professional poet of regicides, official mouthpiece of democratic atheism, self-chosen champion of a creed of glorified sensationalism, Mr. Swinburne is, however artistic, yet not an artist, and however cultured, yet still an amateur: for he is not creative, not original in the best and largest sense of the word, because not instinct with illuminating ideas. There clings to him too much of the feminine quality. Like the Mary of his own trilogy, he has fallen under many fascinations, he has been the victim of constant amours. Lancelotti was his Chastelard; Hugo is certainly his Bethwell. Will the sombre tragedy end by leaving him in the hands of some hard-headed Philistine Elizabeth?

W. L. COURTNEY.

CONSERVATIVES ON THEMSELVES.

I.—CONSERVATIVE ORGANISATION.

IN former days the government of the country, whether the Whigs or Tories were in office, was practically in the hands of the aristocracy. Noble families were usually ranged on one side or the other, much like the Red and White Roses of the fifteenth century. In some of these families, as even now may be the case, brothers would take up different sides. Organisation, as now known, was not thought of. The leading families settled who should stand at each election, usually from personal or family interest, and the only organisation necessary was at a contested election, when, by recklessness of all sorts and lavish expenditure, either side did its utmost to force, intimidate, or cajole the doubtful voters.

One consequence of this was, first, that men of marked ability among the aristocracy, or those they patronised (as young Tory Gladstone, patronised by the Duke of Newcastle), usually found their way into the House of Commons; and secondly, as these men of ability were of course comparatively few in number, the great majority of members were nonentities, simply to vote—who held their seats on good behaviour to their patrons and obedience to their party leaders. In this way all was comfortable to the upper ten thousand, particularly for those who kept in office.

This state of things, however, has been gradually changing by the extension of the franchise and other causes. The Radicals of course broke through it first, and as only able men could break through such rigid tradition and be independent of the despotism of official and aristocratic cliquism, it follows that the extreme left as it may be called—that is the most Radical section of the House—was the most able in proportion to its numerical strength. Slowly the Liberals followed the independence of the Radicals, and, especially in boroughs, able independent Liberals asserted themselves. The Whigs, grudgingly and of necessity, pursued the same path, though at some distance, and last of all came the Conservatives. Independence, however, in the Tory ranks of the narrow aristocratic clique by any means, however able—as, for instance, Mr. Disraeli in his early days—has always been checked as much as possible. In this way, although each party has had the benefit of the ability of that portion of the aristocracy which allied itself to it—and often, as now, this has been great—the abilities and power of its rank and file followers in the House of Commons, relatively to its numerical strength, has been necessarily in a descending scale from the Radical to the Conservative.

I think this at the present moment is obvious. The extreme Radical party, led by Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Morley and others, is small in number, but it is immensely more powerful and able in proportion to its numbers than the Conservative party of 250 members.

What the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867 began in this way will now be absolutely completed by the Franchise Act of 1884. The power of families, however high, to decide elections is practically gone, and each party must depend on the strength of its following and the ability of its advocates. As the foreman may influence more votes than the employer, so the agricultural labourer may influence more votes than his feudal landlord. The consequence will be that even able members of the aristocracy will have to win their political spurs like ordinary persons, though they will always have great advantages if they can make use of them. The mediocrity, however, will be swept away whenever any one of ability opposes it.

The first conclusion we come to, then, is that in the past everything artificially has tended to make the Conservative party dependent for special ability and leaders on the upper classes; that the supply of ability of late has not been equal to that of the Liberal side, and has been gradually getting less, and must, if the present constitution of the party be continued, under the new state of things get worse both in quality and quantity. Mediocrity of whatever rank will have to give place to ability, power of speaking, and other popular qualities; and the masses will be very apt to take these whatever their political creed.

The Conservative organisation in the past has suffered from the same causes which have lowered the standard of ability of the party in the House of Commons as above referred to, namely, that of depending almost solely on the aristocratic and landed gentry class. It has, in fact, not only depended on these classes, but consisted of them and only them. Where these have been able and zealous the party organisation has been maintained, though any assistance, much less the expression of independent opinion, from below has been too often resented. The strength of an organisation depends on the earnestness of its component members, and each one, however humble, feeling he has a place and a share. The Radical caucus aims at this, and is now proverbial. It represents a party active and zealous, with objects to gain and a determination to gain them.

The second conclusion we must come to, then, is that at present the strength and earnestness of the organisation of the different parties of the State varies in the same descending scale, that of the Conservative party being lowest.

The practical effect, therefore, of the past has been to place the Conservative party at a disadvantage both as to men of ability in the

House of Commons and as to organisation. This, however, must now be all changed, and organisation of the whole rank and file of the party, where every unit, however humble, will have his due weight, becomes essential. Some may say this is fully recognised, and that the working classes are always being patted on the back and flattered by leading Conservatives. At times there is much truth in this, and in words the working classes are considered. When, however, the rank and file ventures to express any decided difference from their supposed betters, what then? What happened last year with the National Union of Conservative Institutions? No doubt there may have been many reasons for that agitation, but the one which gave it life, as is evident from the published correspondence, was the fact that throughout the country there was a feeling that it was the beginning of the assertion of the proper position of the rank and file of the Conservative party.

Looking, however, at matters from a practical point of view, we have now in each constituency an overwhelming number of the rank and file. They—the rank and file—are each year growing more educated; they are aware they have the power of settling the election, for the Radical leaders take care they shall know this. They will organise and make their power felt. To my mind, this is the bright spot of our party. It is childish to play with them, and to think they will be amused and kept out of mischief by pretending to be a party but having no power. They have the power, and they are the power of the Conservative party. If this is not so, then the Conservative party does not and cannot exist.

Hitherto we have tried to organise and put life into our party from the top; we must now do it from the bottom. We have been trying to heat a mass of water by placing fire at the top of the kettle; close to the fire the water may be hot, but the rays of heat penetrate downwards to no distance, and the mass remains cold and indifferent to the heat. We must now place the fire at the bottom, and so allow each atom of the water to rise to the level which its warmth justifies. If this is done, in a very short time the whole mass will be heated. It may, indeed, boil over and get out of bounds, but this depends on the cook, and it is a danger that must be faced. It is of no moment compared with the ill effects of the coolness and deadness of the mass.

Another consideration which few realise at all is the effect on the people of this *bona-fide* organisation of making every one have a real share in the party. Many a man thinks himself a Liberal and votes as a Liberal from sheer ignorance. He has always been led to suppose that the Conservative party is simply for the rich and for the privileged classes. Working men have often said this to me; some have even apologised and hoped they were not taking too much upon themselves in giving an opinion upon Conservative

politics. Really make these men understand that this sort of thing is past; make them feel that they are to have their proper voice in political matters; that they are not to be politically snubbed until a day or two before the election and then patronised in the hope of getting their votes; that Conservatism is national and based on the people, and not to bolster up the few; make them see what we mean by Conservatism and Conservative organisation, and tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of these men, and especially the young men, will join our party, and, what is more, work for it heart and soul. I have seen men earning but a pound or so a week give up a day's pay to work at an election, when at the same time I have heard the great man of the place excuse himself on the pretext of a shooting or hunting-party. Men in the humbler spheres of life are much more in earnest than others. An organisation with a soul in it will develop this energy and will use it in our cause. Those who know the working of friendly societies must be aware of the energy, power, and ability with which they are managed and have been established, often by illiterate men. This power can and may be utilised for Conservatism. To my mind one of the great reasons for our weakness, as compared with the Radicals, is that Radicalism has been the work of a small section of these people, while Conservatism has been but too often regarded as the amateur amusement of the upper classes.

One of the obvious dangers of this thorough organisation from the bottom may be referred to, namely, that the power of the whole machinery is apt to get into the hands of a few wirepullers, as is the case with the caucus. This is an evil and a danger—but what then? It must be guarded against, and as the number of people who take an interest in the party welfare increases, the danger becomes less and less. Of course we cannot expect the working classes to be better than their betters. For has not all party management for ages been conducted in the name of the party by a few aristocratic wirepullers? The danger, however, will be found to be less the broader the basis of the organisation is made and the keener the interest that is taken in the party by that organisation.

The real *crux*, however, conceal it how we may, is this—Does Conservative organisation mean continuing the old dead system, and putting a working man in here and there just to keep him and his class in a good humour and to make pretence we are going with the times; or does it mean that awful Frankenstein creation, where every man, however humble, will have his share in the party, and which when perfected will be an organisation to really appoint and lead the future leaders both in pace and policy?

I am convinced that this last is the only organisation worth the name. Come it must—with household suffrage it comes as sure as

fate. If the Conservative is afraid of it he is afraid of the inevitable. If it really means the extinction of the Conservative party, the party must be extinguished. If, on the other hand, it means—as I venture to think it does—a feeling of an individual share, responsibility, and interest in the doings of the Conservative party by each Conservative, however humble in station, the building of the party by the people, the foundation of the party on the people, the nationalisation of the Conservative party, carrying out the idea of Lord Beaconsfield when he asked, “What is the Tory party unless it represents the national feeling?”—then, I venture to assert, that it will electrify the valley of the dry bones with new life, with youthful powers, and with national usefulness.

Another disadvantage which the Conservative party feels more and more from its deficient organisation is the want of touch between the leaders and the rank and file. The aristocratic leaders live in a lofty sphere but in a limited one. The upper ten thousand is a very important body, but now that there are to be five millions of voters it is very small numerically, and will carry less and less party weight. The Carlton Club is mainly composed of the same social class as that in which the leaders move, and is consequently almost equally narrow and restricted. As an example, on a recent occasion at a large dinner a nobleman stated that he could not think where the Radicals were; he never met them in society, or in travelling, or anywhere else. The consequence of this narrow circle is that the real Conservative party may be absolutely changing outside, as indeed is now the case, without its leaders seeing it or knowing it, or even feeling it. To correct this is a most important use of efficient organisation throughout the whole party from the bottom upwards. No general, however skilful, can be successful who does not understand his followers, even when those followers are absolutely under his command. When, as is the case, the followers really elect their own officers, a mutiny must be chronic unless the leaders are in touch, sympathy, and complete accord with their rank and file.

When, however, the Conservative party among all and especially among the working classes is really organised from the bottom, when it has that solid existence which it is now dimly trying to secure, when the rank and file has the power in the party which it certainly will have, and when it is recognised as a vital and integral part of the party, what then? If the party will then be so small as to be insignificant, as some seem to think, then it will not much matter what happens to it. If, however, it becomes immensely more powerful, more able, more in earnest, and more patriotic, as I believe will be the case, will it remain Conservative, and if so what will it conserve? Here is the rub. Will it conserve the aristocratic member of Parliament? Will it conserve the privileges of the few? Will

it conserve the present land laws? Will it conserve the Church? Will it conserve the House of Lords? Will it conserve the rights of private property? Nay, will it conserve the throne itself?

The fear that the wrong answer may be given to these great questions is to no small extent at the bottom of the timidity of the Conservative party leaders in heartily giving the party a real organisation. They act as if they were afraid of the evident result of their own action. They have given the people the power, but they fear openly and freely to trust them with it. It is as if a parent were to present his child with a loaded revolver, and then try to keep hold of the muzzle lest the child should point it at him. If the child is not fit to be trusted with the revolver, we should have resisted the granting of the Franchise both in 1867 and in 1884. Having, however, accepted that step, and done so rather ostentatiously, it is no time to cry back and attempt still to hold the muzzle. Doing that will probably be very dangerous, for it will be seriously resisted, even by numbers of those whose only present idea is to use the weapon in the defence of the Conservative and national interests.

Why not freely and openly trust the people we have made supreme, as we theoretically and indeed practically have agreed to do? The real action of the mass of the people both Conservative and Liberal to the great subjects I have referred to will be, I am convinced, that each of these time-honoured institutions will be weighed in the balance and the verdict given according to the way it is promoting the welfare of the country. The welfare of the country will be the Conservative cry of the future, and what more Conservative cry could we have? If the aristocratic member of Parliament is that and nothing more, he will be swept away, and his place taken by one more able even if of more humble origin. If, however, he is a politician, a speaker, a worker, taking an actual interest in his constituency, and doing his best for it and for his country, he will stay, and his aristocratic blood will advantage him not a little. The privileges of the few, that is their artificial advantages of birth and station, will without doubt be reduced. This, indeed, has been the tendency for many years, and it clearly will go on, perhaps now faster than before. The present land laws will certainly be completely changed; as who, from a national point of view, can possibly defend many of them, and such landlords as some of the great London landowners? The fraudulent theories of such men as Mr. George will, however, not be tolerated by the masses any more than by other classes. If the Church continues, as she has of late years, to work for the good of the people, honestly, loyally, and disinterestedly, she will die very hard indeed, if indeed she die at all in our children's or grandchildren's time. The agricultural labourer will certainly not want to destroy the Church. If she lapses into the state she was in

at the beginning of this century, she will go. The private rights of property will be as safe in the hands of the people as they have ever been. The House of Lords, unless put in order, very soon will go, or be ruthlessly reformed. If made what it might be made and ought to be made, by the patriotic efforts of its own members, it will last for ages as the best form of a second chamber, the advantages of which the people see as readily as others. The Crown, as long as worn in the way it is and always has been by the present illustrious lady, and in the way her heir gives promise to wear it, is safe, though another George IV. would shake the institution to its foundation.

The fact of the matter will be undoubtedly that the masses will look at things from their own standpoint and in their own interest. This may turn out to be more truly than ever synonymous with the national interest. The upper classes have for generations looked at and acted for those same matters to a great extent in their own interest, and this has certainly not always been, either by Liberals or Conservatives, in the national interest. The landowner looks at any change in the law from his point of view, the manufacturer does the same, the agriculturist the same, the shipowner the same, and the railway director the same. The newly enfranchised will probably do the same, and as they will have the numerical strength behind them they will ultimately get their own way. This, however, does not imply that their aim and object will be revolutionary or confiscatory. They will require to be convinced that the laws and institutions are the best for the country and for themselves as an important part of it, and that changes in these laws are likely to improve the country and themselves along with it. When they are thus convinced they will maintain the laws thus made rigidly, and perhaps more obstinately than the extremest Tory. A man with 15s. a week and half as many children will not go out of his way or sacrifice much to conserve the rank of his landlord, any more than a rich earl would give up his possessions and impoverish his family to conserve the right of his cousin to wear strawberry leaves. Once prove to the former that under the English constitution, as compared with any known form of republican or other government, his 15s. a week is safest and most likely to increase; that he gets most for it; that his children have the best education and chance in life; that, hard as his lot may be, he has no hindrance to improve it, but every legal and social encouragement to reap the permanent fruit of his own industry and labour—then he will conserve the old-fashioned Crown, Lords, and Commons, and stick to that form of government more rigidly and earnestly even than his richly-endowed and aristocratic landlord.

One great business of sound Conservative organisation is to teach the people, not the jargon of party cries, but the real national interests, and so let all classes hear both sides of every question.

Undoubtedly the greatest danger of the future is that numbers of the people may be influenced by the demagogue, and that politicians, knowing the advantage of popularity, will fear to speak out the truth when by so doing they may momentarily offend. The only way to counteract this is to have an able Conservative party really organised, and in which the people have faith and confidence. Such an organisation will meet the statements of demagogues and opponents, not with abuse and loose assertions, but with real refutations and arguments—through the press, through speeches, by the personal influence of the local members of the House of Commons, or by the candidates, by lecturers, and by the local party leaders, who, having been selected by the locality under an efficient organisation, will then have real weight. What a scope also this work now gives for loyal and patriotic and Conservative peers who have so much time on their hands!

Surely it is better to look these things in the face, rather than to resist every alteration to the great institutions I have referred to till it is too late, and then to rush recklessly and bid for popularity at any cost. Our Conservative party should initiate necessary reforms in those very institutions which we hold so dear. What should we think of a man who loved his ancestral hall so much that sooner than have it repaired he allowed it to fall about his ears? It is often said that we should let sleeping dogs lie. "Do not attempt to touch this or that venerable institution. If you once begin to touch it you do not know what may become of it. Let sleeping dogs lie." But the dogs cannot sleep. The Radicals have a bunch of burning faggots always in their faces and delight in singeing them. The sole question will be whether they are to be reformed and made to suit the present times by a friendly hand or uprooted by a bitter opponent. By waiting too long the opportunity of the former course may be lost.

The Conservative party, when organised as I have described from the bottom, will really have, as it never yet has had, an organisation. What is more, that organisation will insist on the party having a policy, and that policy will be the great policy, alike in foreign, colonial, and domestic matters, of upholding, strengthening, and improving our great country, its noble institutions, and every individual member of it. If the public thought that this was our policy now we should long ago have been able to defeat utterly the Radical Socialism, feeble Liberalism, and revolutionary theories that are abroad. Some Conservatives have been hoping to come into office as soon as a sufficient reaction, as it is called, of public opinion has taken place. If we come in on reaction we cannot keep in on reaction. The benefit we derive from it can be but the refreshment of a passing shadow on the desert—pleasant, no doubt, while it lasts. A patient may succumb when an adverse reaction takes him, as we did in 1880. A favourable reaction, which we now have, is of great use if we take advantage

of it to enable the constitution to be built up with solid and strength-giving nourishment. Let us be sure that this part of the receipt is followed. Some hope for our party to come in on the unpopularity and failure of our opponents, and the consequent disasters of our country. This is like trusting to one's own bankruptcy to teach one's wife economy. The object of all, Government and Opposition, is to promote the welfare of the country, though this is at times forgotten. One party may profit by another's mismanagement, but if we are patriots and Englishmen we must all wish that our country may be wisely governed, whoever is in office. If we get into office three or four times by such blunders as have lately been made by the present Government, it will not be long, as most people see, before the greatness of Old England will be a thing of the past.

We all want and hope to get into office, no doubt, but the existence of an Opposition is acknowledged to be essential, whatever party may be in power. However strong and good a Government may be, the longer it is likely to remain strong and good, the more keenly its words and actions are criticised by an able Opposition. The stronger the Government the more important in this respect is the work of the Opposition. The most dangerous form of party Government, and the one capable of doing most mischief, is the one we have had for five years, namely, a very strong Government and a very weak Opposition. The only way to make a powerful Opposition is to have a really powerful organisation based on the broad lines I have briefly indicated.

Whether we like it or no, the future Conservatism will be democratic, and the future Conservative organisation will also be democratic. It will include the base of the pyramid as well as the apex. It will have its disadvantages, no doubt, as all earthly things have, but it will, I think, bring out good men and true from an untapped source in greater number than some people suppose. I see no reason to fear it in any way. No doubt it will shock the exclusive Tories of the past, but that is no reason why it should not be patriotic, constitutional, and really Conservative. The danger I see is in the present exclusive Conservative party, acting like the Church of England did last century when it turned Wesley from its fold. The consequences of this step a century of effort has not been able to recover. Throughout the country in every class, however humble, the Conservative, constitutional, and patriotic party has staunch supporters growing yearly in intelligence and power. To gather these together, to make them integral parts of our party, and to bind them in close sympathy with the leaders, was the task I hoped to do something towards accomplishing. Until this is done the Conservative party cannot become healthy, strong, and vigorous, or worthy of the proud name which it has a right to bear.

GEORGE C. T. BARTLEY.

II.—THE PAST AND THE FUTURE OF CONSERVATISM.

I do not propose in this paper to consider the question, which the second part of the title may perhaps suggest, of the share likely to be claimed by the Conservative party in the future government of the country, or of the numerical ratio in which its members may be expected to stand, either in the House of Commons or in the constituencies, to their Liberal or Radical opponents. In framing a reply to such questions, there must necessarily be frequent induction from premises or figures which cannot be unconditionally accepted. On the other hand, the suspicion so generously insinuated by some of our adversaries, so gratuitously entertained by some even of our friends, that Conservatism, under the increasing pressure of democratic forces, is doomed to slow but inevitable extinction in England, is one of which the title itself is a formal repudiation; for it would be scarcely worth while to discuss the future of Conservatism if Conservatism were fated to disappear. I say Conservatism as distinct from Conservatives; and I mean by it a recognised political force, wielded by an organized political party, and operating directly or indirectly, according as that party is in or out of office, in the government of the Empire. No one, be he either the most prejudiced of Radicals or the least sanguine of Conservatives, would go so far as to doubt the continued existence, at every future stage of our history, and whatever constitution we may enjoy, of Conservatives, *i.e.* of men and women of moderate or conservative temperament, amounting at all times in their sum total to a considerable portion, probably at many times to a majority of the entire population—no one, I say, would doubt that; for human character, in every age and clime, is just as clearly marked off into two variations, corresponding pretty well to what we call Conservative and Radical, as the human race is divided into the two sexes.

But Conservatives, we are warned by our critics, are not to be confused with Conservatism. The one is a natural type of character, a *lusus nature* no doubt, but still, because natural, ineradicable. The other is a body of political dogma, unnatural, contrary to the eternal fitness of things, and therefore doomed. Character must not be supposed to constitute cause, and a time will eventually come when, though there will be Conservatives, there will be no Conservatism. Such at least is the reasoning of some of the philosophic spirits of the Radical party. If the analogue to this proposition were also admitted to be true, *viz.* that a time will come when though there will continue to be Radicals there will be no Radicalism, we might find our grief at the one loss to some extent assuaged by our exultation over the other. But what is sauce for the Conservative goose is anything but sauce for the Radical gander. We cannot, therefore, expect to conciliate the respectful attention of this section of our

antagonists when we discuss the existence of that which they have by anticipation denied. But for those whose horoscope of the future is framed with less peremptory exactitude, or whose intellect is unable to grasp the distinction between cause and character, between discipline and creed, it may be of some service to point out what have been the principal characteristics in the past, and what are likely to be those in the immediate future, of the important factor in English politics known as the Conservative Party.

Whig, Tory, Conservative, Liberal, Radical, are merely labels with a different inscription for each member of the set, the wearer being at liberty to choose which specimen he pleases, and to keep the world in ignorance of his choice as long as he can. The two first are historic survivals, anachronisms having in reality no place in the politics of to-day. Waiving Dr. Johnson's theory of the genesis of the Whig Party, whereby its pedigree is carried up to a very distinguished if not to a very respectable origin, and accepting for our present purpose a lineage that is at once more modest and more modern, we recognise in Whiggism an order of things and a tone of thought that grew up after the expulsion of the Stuart dynasty, and exercised a powerful and on the whole a creditable sway in England for the best part of one hundred years. Exclusiveness was its badge and privilege its motto; but its achievements were the consolidation of the constitutional monarchy and the building up of Parliamentary government under the rule of a narrow but competent oligarchy. Soon after the opening of this century it gave birth to an offspring, the first exploit of whose precocious manhood was the matricide of the parent, whose ideas were too old-fashioned to harmonize with its youthful aspirations. In consideration, however, of its venerable years and of its past services to humanity, Whiggism was accorded the honours of a decent funeral, and on the tombstone erected by historians over its remains men may read the record of its long and reputable career. It is fifty years since Whiggism was thus consigned to the grave, and the Whig type obliterated. If ever since then it has reappeared upon the earth, it has been as the ghost of a Samuel conjured up on the eve of some great crisis to terrify or denounce a recreant Saul. It is true that we still hear of the old Whig families, and that some of their number fondly imagine that the political tradition survives without breach of continuity in their own persons, and that on the ancestral hearth their hands still feed the imperishable flame. The hereditary Whig cannot conceive a condition of affairs in which he is not, like the poor, always with us. But it would be difficult to explain in what degree, however infinitesimal, the Whig of to-day differs from the moderate Conservative, or why he clings so tenaciously to a title that is only a relic of a vanished past, and that nowadays brings him little but suspicion or contempt. I am speaking of course of the honest Whig, who has

his genuine convictions and who acts upon them, though pride commonly prevents him from calling things by their right names. The dishonest Whig who either has not the convictions, or who, if he has, makes no pretence of acting upon them, has no claim to the appellation beyond that which the grossest hypocrisy or the most shameless effrontery may be considered to afford. To him the Florentine has assigned the sixth circle and the hood that is of gold without, but of lead within.

As regards Toryism, the particular cult to which the name was originally applied is now as extinct as the dodo. Divine right, non-resistance, passive obedience, and their cognate figments, are ideas for which we must look to the folios of the historian, not to the minds of men. In this sense the word Tory is possessed only of an antiquarian interest. It has, however, another signification of later origin and longer subsistence, a sense in which there are many persons who would still claim it as their political patronymic. This is the Toryism that sprang into vigorous being with the younger Pitt, and it lumined with its generous glow the end of the last, and beginning of the present century. If Disraeli could claim to have educated his party, it was a party which Pitt had in the first instance educated or rather created before him. It cannot be too strongly insisted upon that just as Burke is the highest type of the Whiggism whose subsequent decay we have recorded, just as Palmerston was representative of the later but now almost equally defunct Liberalism, and just as Mr. Gladstone has proved himself in these later days the progenitor of a new Radical party, so was Pitt the author of Toryism in its second stage, or, as it has since come to be called, of Conservatism. The articles of that belief—loyalty to the throne, fidelity to the Church, the maintenance of the approved institutions of the country, of the rights of property, and of the liberty of the subject, the obligations of peace, but the superior obligations of honour, were first framed in definite shape by him, and later reformers have seen no reason for departing from the founder's model. And just as to Pitt we can trace back the distinctive principles of Conservatism, so also to his policy must we look for the first practical foreshadowing of those great reformatory measures, the realisation of which is constantly pointed to as the main feature of the first half of this century; though with a solemnity that has masked the impudence of the plea, it has been claimed as the peculiar glory of that party to whose factious opposition it was originally due that Pitt was compelled to abandon them. Catholic emancipation, electoral reform, commercial freedom, were first heard of under his administration, and in a form not very different from that in which they were ultimately cast by the legislature, were the emanations of his brain.

The brilliancy of Pitt's creation was perhaps too great to escape the inevitable law of reaction, by which, upon the disappearance of

the animating spirit, it was for a time obscured. The twenty years that intervened between his death and the commencement of the reform epoch, was a period of weak measures and of mediocre men. Inferior minds traded upon the reputation, without reflecting more than a shadow of the genius of the departed chief. This was the bastard Conservatism, upon which Disraeli in his novels and speeches was never weary of emptying the vials of his scorn. He described its products as pseudo-Tories, men who were ignorant of every branch of political science, who abroad rested on the laurels won by a great commander, and at home mistook routine for statesmanship, and disorganization for sedition. Huskisson and Canning were the first to break through the spell of lethargy, under which the party was fast sinking into impotence, and to recall the spirit of that fairer Conservatism, that seemed to have fled with its most perfect embodiment to another sphere. Then ensued the fateful epoch, when old landmarks were violently upturned, and parties and politics were carried hither and thither by the opposing currents of a cataclysm.

Nor was it till long after that the waves completely subsided, restoring to sight a land with greatly altered features and with entirely new lines of demarcation. In the interim Conservatism, in common with every other form of political belief, presented the unreal and transitional aspect inseparable from a period of hiatus between an old and a new order of things. It was not the Conservatism of Pitt or of Canning. It was not the Conservatism of Liverpool and Castlereagh. It was not the later Conservatism of Peel, or of Beaconsfield. But it was a Conservatism that had neither quite broken with the past, nor made up its mind as to the future. It was waiting and watching the signs of the times, signs which were for a while very discouraging, and not in the least calculated to reawaken confidence, or inspire reconstruction.

The Radical orators who attempt to blacken the character of Lord Beaconsfield by saying that he had himself confessed the hypocrisy of his own creed, should be reminded that the Conservatism which he so described was that passing phase of Conservatism, when neither having recovered its true or abandoned its mistaken connections with the past, nor having as yet ascertained its certain foothold on the future, it was halting between two opinions, and hesitating how much to advance or how little to retreat. Soon the die was cast, and the call of public and of patriotic interest obeyed. From that moment, and from the ashes of the pseudo-Toryism of 1806—1826, and the transitional Toryism of 1826—1846, rose again the fair form of the true Conservatism, as it had first been created by Pitt, then for a brief moment resuscitated by Canning, and now again restored to fulness of life by Peel, a resurrection to be perfected twenty-eight years later in the culminating administration of Lord Beaconsfield. This is the true thread of political continuity, running through the

last century of our history, and connecting its diversified and eventful incident, the principles of parties, and the policies of statesmen, with a chain of firm and indisputable cohesion. Pitt, Canning, Peel, and Beaconsfield are the names that will be perpetually associated with the rise, the progress, and the triumph of the genuine Conservatism.

Up to this point, then, we have seen that as regards Whiggism and Toryism, the Pompey and Cæsar who erewhile disputed the mastery of the world, both, if we consider the original acceptation of the words, are dead, buried, and very nearly forgotten. In so far as Whiggism can be said to survive, it has practically though not nominally, become merged in Conservatism. Passing thence to Conservatism we have seen that the term has a distinct and vital meaning, and represents a policy initiated a century ago, reappearing at intervals since, and at the present moment embraced by a powerful and united party. The meanings and histories of Liberalism and Radicalism it does not concern my present object to pursue. This much, however, may be said in passing, that Liberalism, of which Lord Palmerston has already been quoted as a type, is separated by a broad generic difference from Whiggism, and by almost as broad a one from Radicalism, of which Mr. Gladstone is, if not the parent, at any rate the patron, and of which Mr. Chamberlain is perhaps rightly regarded as the most characteristic exponent. There are signs that Liberalism is losing strength, though at present it is professed by the bulk of what is called the Liberal party; and that Radicalism, hitherto regarded as the creed of an insignificant minority, is rapidly gaining ground. That Liberalism will approximate more closely to Conservatism as time goes on is probable, but that it will become merged in it is for some time unlikely. That Radicalism will move farther away from Conservatism is certain, and that a junction between the two should ever be effected is impossible.

Quite recently, however, a new phenomenon has appeared upon the scene, and entered its name on the list of candidates for popular favour. This is the political theory that, in respect of its principles, has been described as Democratic Toryism, or, in respect of the body which holds them, as a Tory Democracy. These names are of very recent origin, for they had scarcely been heard of, anyhow they had not passed into general usage, before the occurrence of an important by-election for Liverpool in December, 1882. On that occasion Mr. Forwood, the Conservative candidate, and leader of the party in the borough, stood upon the avowed platform of Democratic Toryism. He was defeated, and the *Standard* newspaper, in one of its most censorious articles, authoritatively ascribed the rejection of the Democratic Tory to the insincerity and consequent unpopularity of Democratic Toryism—a charge to which Mr. Forwood replied with much spirit in a monthly periodical.

True or false, Democratic Toryism has at any rate not been snuffed out by the disapprobation of the *Standard* or the sneers of Radical critics. On the contrary, it has gained in the number and influence of its adherents, and in its hold upon the multitude. The name now occupies a recognised place in our political vocabulary; it has been much talked about and written about—a good deal praised and a good deal blamed on public platforms; and Conservative M.P.'s have been heard both to accept and to abjure the title. No doubt its legitimacy stands quite apart from its popularity, and the object we have primarily in view is to discover, not how many people, with either a fair or a feeble notion of what they mean, call themselves Democratic Tories or Tory Democrats, but whether there is such a form of belief: first, whether it is possible; and secondly, whether, if possible, it is desirable. Its popularity has, however, this importance, and this connection with our inquiry, that it proves it to be a force which must be reckoned with even by those who adhere most closely to the traditions of party nomenclature, or who are the strictest Puritans in the matter of political terminology.

Democratic Toryism involves a consideration of two points—the relation of Democracy to Toryism, and the consequent relation of Toryism to Democracy. Clearly we must first come to an understanding upon the nature of Democracy. In other words, before we can hope to find out whether Democracy and Toryism touch, and if so, where, we must realise what we mean when we speak of the former as prevailing in England.

Now, at first sight, there may seem to be no possibility of dispute about this. Democracy, I fancy that most people would reply, is a form of government, the rule of the many, as opposed to oligarchy, the rule of a few, and monarchy, the rule of one. That is the answer, at any rate, that is given by M. Edmond Scherer, the critic whom we may describe as the Matthew Arnold of France, in his admirable essay on Democracy in that country. It is the answer given by the writer of an article on "The Nature of Democracy," in a recent number of the *Quarterly Review*.¹ And that Democracy in many cases—at Athens, for instance, in the old world, and in modern Switzerland—is a form of government, and nothing less, is undeniable. But that it is necessarily or even commonly a form of government cannot therefore be inferred; and when we use the word in ordinary language, and particularly in relation to our own country, I am inclined to think that we mean something much less definite or definable. Nor is the latitude of common phraseology our only excuse for a more elastic application of the term, but we cannot, in justice to facts, predicate it of the polity under which we exist. For by what form of government is the British Empire ruled?

It seems curious that such a question should be capable of receiving

(1) *Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1884.

more than one answer, and those of a contradictory nature. Yet so it is. The schoolboy, confiding in external evidence, and taking that which offers itself first, will probably answer, "By a monarchy;" for he has not yet learnt the meaning of constitutional fictions, and is dazzled by the traditions of crown and sceptre. The Radical, on the other hand, who philosophises, and derides the shadow so long as he can grasp what he thinks is the substance, will triumphantly reply, "By a Democracy;" and will perhaps seize the opportunity to expatiate upon the sovereign mind and will of the people. And so generally has his assertion been accepted, and so little attempt has been made to examine its foundations, that we appear almost to be straining after a paradox, if we venture upon a denial of its truth. But is it not the fact—which any one who runs may read—that the British Empire is ruled neither by a monarchy, though it has a monarch, nor by a democracy, though it has a Demos; but, however surprising it may seem, by that second most abused of all forms of government, viz., an oligarchy, with occasional and increasingly frequent relapses into that which is the most abused of all, viz., the tyranny of the individual?

Historians are in the habit of pointing to party government as the chief and most admirable product, in this country, of the period since the Great Revolution. But party government, under the influence of a steady and, as yet, unexhausted process of contraction, has shrunk into Cabinet government; or government not by one party over the heads of another, but by a small section of that party which is in a majority, over the heads not merely of the minority, but also of its own followers who constitute the majority. The Cabinet not only construct, introduce, and carry through; legislation; but, in the interests of self-preservation, which appears to be the law of their existence, they think fit to override all opposition, and, by making any question they please one vital to themselves, they impose the will of a small and autocratic oligarchy upon the entire nation. Nay, more, the very arrangement between the two parties in the State, by which the recent differences about the Franchise Bill were adjusted, and the scheme of Redistribution framed, so far from being a departure from these lines, was a development of them never previously dreamt of. For instead of government by an oligarchy, consisting of a committee chosen from one party alone, it was government by an oligarchy consisting of two committees chosen from the two parties, and was in this respect more thoroughly oligarchic in principle, that it was the imposition not of a single despotic will upon two opposite parties, who might conceivably combine to frustrate the purpose of the ruling oligue, but of a twofold will absolutely binding upon both parties, because imposed upon each separately and rendering impossible any attitude of allied antagonism. Further, if we look to the country where public opinion is supposed to be bred and where the

phantasmal creation, the will of the people, is reported to reside; so far from finding any genuine means by which an authentic echo of the national voice may be obtained, we observe only a number of small knots of dictatorial and unscrupulous wire pullers, each framed as closely as possible upon the oligarchic model, and under the guise of the caucus arrogating the functions of a *local* Cabinet. Finally, such deviations from the oligarchic principle as may from time to time occur are in the direction, not of multiplying the depositories of power or of expansion into a democratic form of government, but rather in the opposite direction of centralisation, and of concentrating the sovereign power in the hands of an individual. The influence of oratory upon the masses, the effect of a strong personality upon an impressionable and only half-educated electorate, the wide circulation of reported debates and speeches, the facilities of locomotion, which carry great speakers to every corner of the kingdom and great audiences to listen to them, the glare of publicity shed round the life of public men by the emulous arts of the press scribbler, the photographer, and the caricaturist, even the system of advertisement openly practised by some eminent statesmen themselves—all combine to elevate the man above the mob, and to reproduce in modern England that type of character which, in ancient Athens, presented the opposite extremes of Pericles the patriot and Cleon the demagogue, and that form of government which only fell short of tyranny in being hypothetically based upon popular consent and constitutional order.

If, then, Democracy in England is not a form of government, what is it? The elucidation of the character of that which is our real form of government has already supplied us with an answer. For in proportion as in a highly developed and constitutional State we observe the ruling power to be centred in an oligarchy or an individual (the cases of absolute monarchy and Oriental sultanism are, of course, excluded, inasmuch as they belong to a different genus of States), so we may suspect that the underlying forces are democratic in character. Delegation of power is the distinguishing mark of a Democracy. An oligarchical or a Periclean form of government crowns a democratic state of society, and wields a sceptre conferred by *plébiscite* of the multitude. The Cabinet rules the Radical Party in the House of Commons, and Mr. Gladstone rules the Cabinet; but the Radical Party owes its presence there to the votes of some million *ex-munera* of enfranchised citizens, supposed to be holding a trust for a majority of their unenfranchised countrymen. They have given, and they can take away. Here is the connecting link between the ruled and rulers, and herein lies the influence of the British Democracy. Ignorant though they may be, duped and dictated to as they often are, they yet supply the motive power which awakes to action the complex machinery of our Government. Democracy in England is not a political form, but a political force.

When, therefore, De Tocqueville says that the progress of Democracy is "the most uniform, the most ancient, and the most permanent tendency to be found in history," he is obviously employing the word, in so far as it refers to politics, in the sense with which I have credited it. For it is manifestly true that the march of civilisation has been attended by a widening of the influence exercised by peoples upon their governments, whether the latter be despotic or popular in form. The new German Empire rests on a very different basis to the old German or Holy Roman Empire. The subjects of Alfonso XII. would hardly exchange their position with those of Philip II. If, on the other hand, De Tocqueville had meant by Democracy a form of government, he would have been publishing the most evident fallacy. For so far from the progress of governments being in a democratic, it has been, on the contrary, in a monarchical direction. Republics have in many cases given way to monarchies (*e.g.* the English Commonwealth and the Dutch Republic); but with the exception of America, which from the peculiar conditions of its history and situation stands quite apart, and of France, upon which no sane man would base an argument, no monarchies have been replaced by republics.

Democracy in England being then a name for the action of the public mind upon its rulers—and here we may notice in passing (1) that the wider the scale of enfranchisement adopted the more real becomes that action, so that each fresh reduction of the franchise is justly held to be synonymous with an impulse given to democratic forces; but (2) that the present power of democracy in England is greatly exaggerated, owing to the deceitful tactics of the oligarchs before mentioned, who in order to retain their popularity throughout and their position at the end of their term of office, affect to receive orders from the very people to whom they are in reality communicating them—it is clear that Democracy is brought into constant relations with Toryism, and that in the case of a Conservative Government being returned to power at a general election, a Tory Democracy is not merely a phrase but a fact. It might further be shown that, even with a greatly extended electorate, such a contingency is at intervals extremely likely to recur. I will not say that the British public at the present time is decidedly Conservative, because, though I may think so, I have no means of proving it; but I do say it at all times of the British character. And that, disgusted with the broken pledges of those who, promising to lead them into a land flowing with milk and honey, have abandoned them in a howling wilderness, and in obedience to the instincts of patriotism, of national pride, and of love for religion, order, and constitutional freedom, which are the birthright of a spirited but dignified people, the British public will, from time to time, present a faithful reflex of British character, we may accept as certain.

The Conservative Party, may once have "dished" the Whigs, to adopt the phrase enshrined in our political vernacular, but it is impossible for them ever really to "dish" the Radicals; and why? Because each successive forward move that they make can be followed by a bigger stride on the part of their opponents, and because each principle abandoned means the loss of so much vantage ground from which to conduct the struggle in future. What could be worse either for Conservatives or for the country than that legislation by auction should become the prevailing rule, the prize bid for being the possession of office, and the highest bidder being the successful candidate? Political acrobaticism is a spectacle quite sufficiently familiar without the need of amateurs entering the arena, and vying with the old professors of the tight rope and trapeze. A graver reproach cannot be directed against a Conservative than hint that he is a Radical in disguise. Political opportunism is the curse of a democratic era.

I would not be thought to have suggested in these remarks that Conservatism should strip itself of anything but what is adventitious to its real character or an impediment to the prosecution of its central aim. The principles of Conservatism have not varied since the days of Pitt or Canning: for principle soars above circumstances, and looks down upon time. Time and circumstance will mould a policy, but the grit of which principle is formed is hard as adamant, and is not to be impaired by length of the one or force of the other. There are four groups of interests, covering the entire field of politics, upon each of which the Conservative Party holds, and must continue to hold, opinions, whose sacred and essential nature has justly elevated them into the superior grade of principles. These groups, which we are in the habit of personifying, though they involve in some cases more or less abstract conceptions, are the State, the Church, the Empire, and the People. In each of these departments it will be found that the opinions held by Conservatives are those very opinions by which they are distinguished from Radicals, and which may therefore be described as the *differentia* of Conservatism. I have not space to do more than briefly allude to them.

In the sphere of the State, the defence of the institutions of the country has long been recognised as the corner-stone of the Conservative creed. It is interesting to compare the words in which this truth was enforced by Disraeli at two periods of his life, sometimes accused of presenting features of wide divergence. In 1865, when not yet in Parliament, he wrote:—"The Tory Party supports the institutions of the country, because they have been established for the common good, and because they secure the equality of civil rights, without which no government can be free, and based upon which principles every government is in fact a democracy;"¹ and in 1867, when leader

(1) In "Vindication of the English Constitution."

of the House of Commons, and within six months of becoming Prime Minister, he said :—"The Tory Party is nothing unless it represent and uphold the institutions of the country. For what are they? They are entirely in theory, and ought to be entirely in practice, the embodiment of the national necessities, and the only security for popular privileges."¹ The institutions which Conservatism is thus pledged to uphold are—the Crown, as the apex and safeguard of our constitution; the House of Lords, as a second chamber possessing the independence to act honestly, and the power to act effectually, in the revision of laws, the defence of imperilled interests, and the prevention of revolution: and the two remaining estates of the realm, each discharging its due functions, and preserving the equipose of the whole. A further institution of which Conservatism is rightly considered the champion, is that of property, making thereby no exclusive claim for landed in preference to other interests, for property is both real and personal, but protesting against the invasion of those rights which property confers, and States have always recognised, and resisting the attempts which are made by extremists of the opposite party to augment the already excessive burdens laid upon property in land. I am aware that Mr. Matthew Arnold, in a recent lecture delivered in America, and since published in this country, makes delicate fun, as is his wont, of the notion that States are saved by institutions, and lays stress on what he conceives to be the opposite truth, that their salvation is dependent upon their study of what is noble and pure, in the words of Scripture upon their "loving righteousness and hating iniquity." The answer to his criticism is a very simple one. It is partly because they regard the institutions of this country as an expression of that which is noble in theory and sound in practice, and partly because they see in their maintenance the best security for the national pursuit of righteousness and avoidance of iniquity, that Conservatives make this principle, as I have said, the corner-stone of their creed. In the sphere of the Church, Conservatism will continue to support the establishment, on the ground that the connection between Church and State lends stability to the Church, and sanctity to the State, and that its dissolution would involve the weakening of the one and the demoralisation of the other.

: In Imperial politics, Conservative principle asserts the superiority of British interests, and vindicates the claims of national honour. To preserve the empire in its integrity, it insists upon the provision of adequate military and naval establishments at home and abroad, and by being prepared for war, furnishes the surest guarantee for the continuance of peace. In order still further to strengthen the Imperial union, it advocates a closer relationship with the various and widely scattered units, and espouses the cause of colonial federation.

Touching the people, it would be unfair to lay any special stress

(1) In a speech at the Mansion House, Aug. 13, 1867.

upon the general principle of the welfare of the nation, inasmuch as all parties are agreed in pointing to that as the end of their political action, though some of them adopt a very peculiar method of arriving at it. But there is a particular sense in which the Conservatism of the future must undertake the cause of the people, the circumstances being of a character that have never before arisen in our history, and that impose a duty upon Conservatism which it would be both ill-advised and disloyal to itself were it to refuse. To Conservatism all thoughtful men must henceforward look to provide a rampart against the spread of Socialism in this country. No other party can respond to the call, for the Liberals are already fatally compromised by the passing of such measures as the Irish Land Act, and the Radicals have not clean hands, being in many cases in open league with the Socialists. No more curious instance, indeed, of the turn of fortune's wheel could be adduced than the fact that while the Radicals of the last generation were the most uncompromising advocates of *Laissez faire*, those of this are its bitterest opponents, or that the cause of civil liberty is now in danger from those who were once its doughtiest champions, viz. the Liberal Party. It is not against State interference *per se* any more than it is in favour of *Laissez faire per se*, that Conservatism must take its stand. The doctrine of private enterprise may easily be pushed to extremes; but that is not the meaning of individual freedom. The necessity for Government intervention may often be proved, but that is no justification for socialism. Half the measures commonly described as socialistic, such as the Sanitary, Education, Adulteration, and Factory Acts, are only socialistic in the means they employ, not in the end at which they aim. Socialism proper means the interference of the legislature with the object of artificially redistributing wealth, and equalising the material condition of all classes in the community. But the above measures were excused, and rightly so, on the grounds of justice or of public expediency, and are, therefore, deficient in the main requisite of the Socialist school. It is against what I have called Socialism proper, best known as yet in England by the proposal for the nationalisation of the land, but lurking in every corner and protruding its repulsive features, through every chink, that Conservatism must array all its energies. There is a borderland of debatable territory between the frontiers of individual liberty and of State control, and the custody of this neutral zone is now committed to the Conservative party. Upon them it depends to save the British Democracy from rushing into the snare which the Socialists are spreading for it, when they extol State intervention as the speediest and most drastic remedy for all social or political ill, and to cherish that spirit of self-help, that free play of the individual character, and that heritage of personal liberty which have been among the most efficient causes of England's greatness.

GEORGE N. CURZON.

III.—JONAH.

WE are all of us familiar with a noteworthy episode in the career of the most celebrated of the minor Prophets. But the very familiarity of the incident with which Jonah has come to be peculiarly associated has, perhaps, tended to obscure, at least in the case of superficial observers, other facts and features in the history of this particular seer, which are not altogether undeserving of consideration. And perhaps the lesson (especially appropriate to a generation like the present) to be derived from the unique experiences of the Prophet, may be inculcated in a manner more accordant with the Homiletics of our own day, if the character of the individual as well as the most striking circumstances of his life are included in a general and comprehensive survey.

There can be no doubt that Jonah enjoyed the reputation of being the most eloquent man of his day. Otherwise he would hardly have been selected for a pilgrimage of passion which was to stir the feelings and change the convictions of a great and civilised nation. Moreover, like many if not all illustrious orators, he was an egotist, perhaps it may be admitted an irritable egotist. To him the reputation of his oratory, the public acceptance of his divine mission—nay, even the enjoyment of the ephemeral distraction by which he hoped to shut out the light of day and the common lot of man, was more precious than the lives of hundreds of thousands of his fellow-creatures, or the maintenance of the greatest Empire of the world. But in spite of these well-marked and distinguishing characteristics, which indeed are such as have earned the love and confidence in other ages of many millions of human beings, it is impossible to deny that the son of Amittai had his weaker side. No one has a right to question his personal daring; indeed, we all know that the sting of disappointment or what is called the courage of despair could stimulate him to the exhibition of even a reckless disregard of personal safety. Yet, however remarkable may have been the hardihood which he could muster in such exceptional circumstances, it is no less true that when called upon to discharge a distasteful but none the less indispensable duty, he could shrink from it with a pusillanimity that was almost if not quite fatuous, and a perversity that was altogether imbecile.

The great soldier-statesman who probably did more to rescue Rome from her death-grapple with Hannibal than even the most showy of his successors, is known to have saved his country by a policy of delay. But we can hardly imagine Fabius, when appointed to the supreme command against the Carthaginian invader, taking refuge on board a ship of Tarshish, as a means of averting a collision with the enemy. A Fabian policy, as conceived by its author, con-

sisted rather in a series of strategic movements, of which the set purpose was to embarrass the enemy while avoiding a pitched battle, than to embarrass his own country by a perpetually-reiterated uncertainty as to whether he meant to fight or not. *Unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem.*

But the delays which saved the Roman Republic were not the exhibitions of a wretched inability to arrive at a resolution or the desperate struggles of a confused will to escape the responsibility of action. No Roman general could have conceived the possibility, even if he had not a very sufficient reason to dread the consequences of shirking his duty: but our Hebrew prophet, confronted as he was by a more perilous mission than that of encountering the victor of Cannæ, may perhaps seek an excuse in that emotional temperament which has always accompanied genius, when he endeavoured to escape from his manifest destiny by the simple expedient of declining to recognise it.

The world around us, perhaps even the limited continent of Europe, may even now afford us examples of military politicians, who, with a particular object in view, have been content to await the fulfilment of their desires through months and years of patient expectancy. But in these happy islands the soldier, for the time at least, has been reduced to a subordinate part; the statesman is as obsolete as the dodo. It is our blessed lot to be governed by prophets, and every six or seven years to derive a fresh impulse to our national policy from the inspired ravings of the latest favourite of the crowd. The hero as prophet was, according to the late Mr. Carlyle, one of the loftiest types of humanity. So much at least of his teaching we have been prompt to realise, and every Mokaïna who appears among us finds as many satellites among the instructors of public opinion as ever loitered in Ahab's groves or fed at Jezebel's table. Manhood has come to be no better than barbarism in our eyes. Statecraft is an abomination, odious as the machinations of those who achieved Peace with Honour. We are ruled as we deserve by the prophets; but, alas! when our prophets refuse to prophesy, what can we do then?

Some such sentiment, or at least some mental process more or less akin to it, has perhaps, however dimly, forced itself into recognition under the stress of circumstances which have reduced even the present premier, not indeed to silence, but to those laborious exercises in ambiguous phraseology which the sterner critics of an earlier period were wont to stigmatise as deliberate equivocation. So long as the prophets can prophesy at all, and perhaps even more easily when they prophesy falsely, the priests of our new morality can bear rule by their means. And the people, as ever, love to have it so. But when the oracles are dumb, or capable only of a sort of mumbling prevari-

cation, even the most credulous of mobs has a difficulty in simulating enthusiasm. When Jonah, in his aversion to make a practical study of the geography of Central Asia, preferred to take refuge in any vessel which would carry him in an opposite direction; it is hard for even the staunchest adherents to prate about either his loftier standard of public duty or his superb self-confidence. In the days of the kings of Judah the enterprising Mr. Cook had not yet patented his system of water conveyance in Egypt, or else our prophet, who was evidently not a very good sailor, would doubtless have preferred a trip up the Nile to that more adventurous expedition in which he unfortunately engaged. The Pharaohs were perhaps not quite so sympathetic to subject peoples rightly struggling to be free as those who have more recently directed the policy of Egypt. Yet it can hardly be denied that the unfortunate sovereign, who for so many centuries has slept beneath the waters of the Red Sea, could hardly have gratified a glut for vengeance more effectually than we have seen it achieved by modern philanthropy at El Teb and Tamanieb. Still the prophet even in those days might have found in the antiquities of the Upper Nile problems as interesting, distractions as powerful, as those which the archæology of the Hittite empire has provided for the politicians of our own time. And the only reason why we do not regret that Jonah had not the opportunity of voyaging to the Isle of Meroe, is that if pitched overboard in such a case he might have found the jaws of a crocodile somewhat less accommodating than those of the obliging whale.

There was, of course, always a party in Palestine which regarded the discomfiture of The Great King as a primary article of their national patriotism. Just as the Hellenic communities which a few centuries later had to bear the brunt of encroaching barbarism, the Jingoës of Judea, were wont to uplift their ineffectual protest against foreign aggression and domestic degradation. We are justified in supposing that a period when eloquence could not yet find an advertising medium in a provincial press, Jonah must have made his mark by the merits of his own rhetoric as a great popular orator. But it is plain from his conduct that he had no heart for denouncing the enemies of his country, although as soon as his personal vanity had become involved in the controversy the sacrifice of hecatombs of human lives appeared indispensable when weighed in the scale against the smallest disparagement of his divine mission. We have no means of knowing whether Nahum or Obadiah, or any other leader of opinion at that time, seemed likely to be designated for the defiance of Nineveh in the event of persistent recalcitrance on the part of Jonah, but it is evident that his temporary seclusion in the whale's belly, at a distance from post-offices and the editors of magazines, inspired the prophet with a determination not to decline any position

of authority, however distasteful its duties might become to his peculiar temperament.

It would be absurd to pretend that the crisis through which we are now passing has not a certain resemblance, at least in some of its features, to this Hebrew archetype. From the first days to which history can carry back our knowledge of political society, the Western world has been familiar with the shadow of an Eastern despotism, or perchance of some almost divine figure from the North which, while stifling the ancient autonomies of Asia has used the power thus obtained to threaten the liberties of the more civilised races of the West. There were two opinions, as we know, at Athens concerning the mission and the objects of the Persian Empire. There were Medizers in the days of Themistocles, just as there are Russophobists to be found in Pall Mall. And we may be sure that the civilising effects of Cambyses' Egyptian conquest found quite as ardent advocates in the groves of Academe as the multiple control can show in the present House of Commons. There have always been men who believe that their own country and their own countrymen must necessarily be in the wrong; and these have generally been at the same time politicians who believed that they must necessarily be in the right. It is of course one of the essential characteristics of liberty that it tolerates those to whom liberty is in itself an offence. And it has generally been one of the notes of a robust patriotism that it has aspired to preserve national unity so long at least as it was possible to ignore anti-national sentiments. But there is, as experience warns us, a limit to this sort of toleration. The irresistible tempest which brings with it the dissolution of a parliament or of a ship's company, the destruction of a vessel or of a political party, is not to be evaded by any art of mortal man. Then comes the pinch. In the hour of supreme anxiety, what profits it to chatter about universal brotherhood, or to reprehend the brutal instincts of self-preservation? The subtlest logician who ever seduced his own conscience, or perverted the judgment of his fellow-countrymen to the betrayal of public duty, fails to persuade his audience, or even himself, at the moment when the angry waves are yawning to receive the self-convicted author of the common danger. Nor is it reasonable to anticipate that the good offices of the whale would always be forthcoming. As we all know *Inter Delphinos balena Britanica major*, and there is no doubt, if we may judge from recent events, that the gullet of our British leviathan can be supposed to swallow more than any other animal organism can digest. But he is rash indeed who, because he has once been saved from the stroke of fate by any such providential interposition would dare again to leap overboard during foul weather with the hope of repeating an unmerited escape.

It will therefore be apparent that, as far as it is possible to forecast

anything of the probable action of a man exposed for the second time to tempestuous weather, such as may when first encountered have prompted recourse even to the happy despatch, we can hardly expect a voluntary repetition of the policy of self-effacement. If, however, we are right in supposing that Jonah in the first instance was merely the interpreter, as a great orator should be, of the sentiments of his *compagnons de voyage*, it is not altogether unlikely that a similar or even greater stress of danger and difficulty may suggest again the same course of action without waiting to see their convictions formulated or adopted by the person especially interested in the matter. In spite of all that scientific inquiry has done for us in progressive ethics and exact physiology, there yet lingers in the minds even of highly developed politicians, something of the old superstition that Nemesis can be propitiated by the sacrifice of a scapegoat. There were men on board that ship of Tarshish who were probably quite as indifferent to the fate of Nineveh and to the prestige of the little Hebrew kingdom, as the recreant prophet had proved himself to be. Yet their complicity with his opinions did not inspire any scruples on their part as soon as self-preservation demanded his overthrow. The very men who had eagerly competed for the honour of carrying his luggage when he came on board, who had striven to recommend themselves to his notice by their emulation to become the bearers of the prayer-rug and rolls of manuscript which formed his scanty baggage, were doubtless the first and foremost to heave into the deep a comrade whose unfortunate choice of the wrong destination seemed likely to involve them in a common ruin. They did not anticipate, they had no reason to expect, as the luckless passenger disappeared among the furious billows, that by any possible means he would emerge again upon *terra firma*. They thought they had seen the last of him as he vanished into the deep to which they had consigned him; and each of them doubtless blessed his stars and thanked his own particular idol for a good riddance of bad rubbish.

If there should be among us a public man who has, like Jonah, already once experienced the horrors of abandonment by his comrades; if we think that we can point at any person in a position of responsibility, upon whom the lessons of one ostracism have been thrown away, we should hardly, as reasonable men, look to the individual so peculiarly circumstanced to repeat the initiative in his own overthrow. But none the less apparent may be the necessity of such an expiation. It may even be possible that the self-willed peer may, during the most critical moment, affect an inclination to cover his retreat by a show of indignation against Nineveh and the Ninevites. A prophet who has had once to choose between the unascertained depths of the stormy sea and a not extremely exhilarating seclusion, dedicated to the study of the inner life of the leviathan, will scarcely

consent again to take the fatal plunge. He will be ready to palm himself off upon his distracted messmates as the beau ideal of orthodox patriotism. Just as Mr. Jeffrey foresaw that Napoleon would "beat the Prussians and eat the Russians," so would the Edinburgh prophet of our own day train his tongue to vaticinations of enterprises at least as adventurous, if by so doing he could persuade anybody that he had not sought to evade his duty and his destiny. See how the ship is rocking; it would seem as if the helmsman, superior to all the warnings of experience, and relying solely upon the recognised rectitude of his own almost perfect character, had steered his vessel into the very heart of a cyclone. From every quarter in turn the tempest bursts upon us with continually increasing fury. The charts which earlier mariners used to study have all been consigned to the bonfire which celebrated the advent of a more heroic theory of seamanship. The stupid old sea-dogs who tried to keep their craft off the breakers, the exploded empirics who strove to tack about when they encountered an unfavourable wind—all these are out of date. Just about the time when political economy was banished to Saturn, the art of political navigation retired to the more congenial atmosphere of Neptune. Our new dispensation prescribes as one of its cardinal principles, that as soon as you encounter an adverse gale you should set every sail, and let the ship drive as near the vortex as chance may take her. The ship's company who signed articles embodying a recognition of these novel doctrines, and some of whom displayed a somewhat offensive attitude in their vindication before they came on board, stand aghast as they contemplate the course of their vessel. The bullies of yesterday are the meek apologists of to-day; and the gasconading vaunts of those who were to introduce a new era of the gubernatorial science with wan faces and drooping jaws are unable to disguise their terror. Look at that burly bargee whose tongue, if he had been born in Britain, would have made him the bugbear of the Cam, and whose command of popular invective might have raised him even to rank as the Brutus of Billingsgate,¹ his bawling utterance is hushed, his hoarse chuckle has become inaudible: with pallid lips and downcast brow he staggers over the deck without heart enough in his body to take his turn at the capstan or even to vent a coarse expletive. Observe the remainder of the crew. Here is one who has reached that stage of despondency at which relief from anxiety can only be obtained by stimulants which fail to cheer even while they inebriate. Here is the ship's purser but now so glib, so plausible, and so sanguine, beginning to balance in his mind whether it may not be better all to go to the bottom together than to have to explain to his owners

(1) Brute or Brutus is in this country a name derived from the eastern Mediterranean; Billingsgate, as everybody knows, owes its appellation to Bellinus, supposed to have been a king of Tyre.

the state of the ship's accounts. There is the pert cabin boy, whose impudence seemed equal to any occasion, straining his glass in the vain hope of discovering a passing sail or friendly haven. The prophet himself is lashed to the wheel, in which awkward position a happy stoicism enables him to distract his mind by the study of the latest of papyrus recording, with hieroglyphic art, the most thrilling episodes in the history of the Hittite empire; he has preserved for lighter reading a rare copy of the memoirs of the prophetess Huldah, recently brought out by a novice in that college of which she was such a distinguished ornament. One ancient mariner is singing psalms. One or two of the younger members of the party find an imperfect consolation in subdued blasphemy, but all seem equally powerless to avert the impending ruin.

In a situation so profoundly discouraging any suggestion would be welcome from whatever quarter it proceeded. And it is probable that if the seer would even now afford the last and best test of his inspiration by volunteering to go overboard, the experiment would, perhaps sadly, but still unflinchingly be adopted. The Billingsgate champion looks as if he had secreted about his bulky person something which may either be a life buoy for the preservation of his own precious existence, or a coil of rope which would come in useful to bind hand and foot any living article of jetsam by which it may be proposed to lighten the ship. But, as has been said, such a suggestion is not now to be expected from a willing victim. There is no Curtius in this crew, nor much of that which Curtius typified. Yet even the cabin-boy is beginning to perceive that if the ship's head is to be put about at this critical moment, it is necessary at once and for ever to part company with the egotistical enthusiast who has involved them in this catastrophe. If Zion is to be preserved, the armies of Nineveh must be arrested. Here is the man on whom was imposed the duty, with whom rests the power, of striking a blow at that empire which shall result, if not in its actual overthrow, at least in its humiliation. This duty he declines, this power he prefers to trifle with. How is the master of so many legions to believe in the spirit and the devotion of the little State which stands forward as the bulwark of freedom and purity, when the man who has only to speak to shake to its foundations his vast but heterogeneous empire, has turned his back upon his duty and clings to any distraction which may obscure from his own eyes if not from those of others the awful responsibility of the position to which he has been called?

When the gale began it was from the south-east; thence has it shifted due east and somewhat northerly; here it is from the old quarter, with some apparent inclination to come next from the south. And with every change it blows harder. A better crew might be pardoned if they began to stagger and to be at their wit's end. It

was all very well when the shouting crowd on the quay at Tyre acclaimed a voyage undertaken in a spirit so heroic and under auspices so saintly. If ever an enterprise had a right to be regarded as a new departure, this deserved to be so regarded. But now that the hurricane has overtaken them, and the tempestuous waves threaten every moment to engulf the luckless craft, it would appear that they have no Paul as a passenger, but a very different sort of Fakir. Is it worth while, everybody begins to think, at once to imperil further the merchandise, the ship, and the ship's company, when to persevere in their present course is merely a futile attempt to evade the particular destiny which a slippery fanatic is seeking to shun? If we can but free ourselves from this incubus we may not, indeed, escape the tempest, but at least we shall have the melancholy satisfaction of having dissociated ourselves from any fellowship with one whom Nemesis has clearly marked down. And if we are all to go to the bottom, let us at least, before our final submersion, separate ourselves from one whose petulant caprice has been the cause of our undoing. It is not for us to pry into the mysteries of the deep, or to speculate upon what transformation into something new or strange this Protean personage may have to undergo when he has suffered the sea-change which we contemplate for him. He is not easy to catch, when he tries to baffle pursuit: he will never be at a loss for arguments, the subtlety of which would perplex the purpose and embarrass the action of those who endeavour to hold or bind him. But none the less, a little resolution, a few moments only of firmness and fortitude, a tight grip and an unhesitating effort, and we shall have relieved ourselves from any further complicity with those who feebly and fatuously fight against fate. Are there still among these panic-stricken sailors any with heads clear enough to apply, before it is too late, this simple method of lightening our vessel? If there are not, they deserve to share the doom which self-will provokes, and equivocation is at last unable to elude.

AN ENGLISH TORY.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

TWENTY-SEVEN years have now elapsed since the passing of the Divorce Act by Lord Palmerston's Government. The Court of Probate and Divorce has become in the interval, one of the permanent institutions of this country. It has been presided over by several eminent judges, and its decisions have lined and furrowed the features of not a few of our English homes. It may not be amiss if I present the public with a general idea of the anticipations which the measure aroused in the Parliament of 1857. I may further endeavour to show how the hopes and fears which then prevailed have been realised, and to estimate the character of the change which the passing of this Act has impressed on our social institutions to-day. Finally, I will attempt to point out the many injustices which have been in operation, notably on women, during the last quarter of a century, and I may perhaps venture to suggest a class of amendments that must inevitably be introduced into the procedure of the Divorce Court in order to mitigate the evils which imperfect legislation has entailed.

Almost every possible aspect of this great social question was debated during the course of the contest over the measure. The great adversaries and uncompromising opponents of the bill in the Upper House were the Bishop of Oxford and Lord Redesdale; while in the House of Commons Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Henley, Mr. Drummond, and Sir J. Bowyer exhausted every effort, first, to suppress the measure, and, secondly, to fundamentally change the characters of its provisions. In his speech on the second reading, Mr. Gladstone, after having gone over the whole ground, and carried his researches from its religious point of view into the most abstruse fields of ancient theology, concluded as follows:—

“Do not let us deal with mankind as if they were creatures of pure intellect, and as if life was governed by conviction. The tradition of past times, and the rules and customs of society which a man inherits, as it were, from those who have gone before him, have more to do with the government of life, perhaps, than any other consideration. The indissolubility of marriage is an idea which has never been shaken in England; at no time have the English people known what it was to have marriage dissoluble. Take care, then, how you damage the character of your countrymen. You know how apt the English habit is to escape from restraint and control. You know what passion dwells in the Englishman; but there is a great feeling of restraint annexed among your population, and which has prevailed ever since parliaments were called—*that the marriage tie is indissoluble.*”

Every other opponent of the measure proceeded more or less upon these lines. Up to the year 1857 only four divorces had been obtained by women, and these for the most painful causes. According to Mr. Gladstone, between 1765 and 1799 ninety-five divorces had been decreed by the House of Lords; in the next thirty-one years down to 1830 eighty-two divorces took place; and in the twenty-six years following, ninety-nine divorces were decreed. As regards the old jurisdiction it is enough to say that an injured husband who established a case against his wife was entitled to a divorce unless it could be proved that he had been guilty of collusion or connivance, unless he was open to recrimination and had been guilty of acts which would entitle the wife to be separated from him, *a mensa et thoro*, by a decree of the Ecclesiastical Court. It was necessary that a man seeking a divorce should first prove the adultery in the Ecclesiastical Court, and obtain from that tribunal a decree *a mensa et thoro*. He must also bring an action against the adulterer. This was the famous case of "Crim. Con." In such an action he must again prove the adultery, and having established his case in that proceeding he was entitled to apply to the House of Lords to be again permitted to prove his case before that tribunal. If he was successful in all three cases he was allowed to receive a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*. It is hardly to be wondered at that under such a procedure the expense alone was sufficient to deter the most aggrieved parties from having a recourse to such an ordeal in litigation. These suits before the House of Lords were called *privilegia*, and they came down in the form of Bills to the House of Commons, a special committee of that House being annually appointed to consider these matrimonial cases from the Lords. The history of the origin of this state of law is curious. The Ecclesiastical Court knew nothing of the divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*; the only divorces they granted were *a mensa et thoro*; and they took in old days bonds which might be forfeited from parties to whom they granted this judgment as a precaution against their remarriage. It is clearly shown in the debate that in the old *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, which was the report of a committee of divines presided over by Cranmer after the abolition of the monasteries, that, under the influence no doubt of Henry VIII., divorce *a vinculo* for the cause of adultery was recognised as being in conformity with religion. These statutes never became the absolute law, and as Mr. Gladstone proved by reference to the writings of one of the three heads of Doctors' Commons in the reign of Elizabeth, their bearings as regards divorce were never re-enacted during the reign of Elizabeth, since the Ecclesiastical Court never granted divorces *a vinculo*. The matter seems to have remained largely in abeyance till the day of Charles II., when Lord de Roos's case occurred, and the King used his influence with the House of Lords to procure an act *a vinculo*

in his case. From that time onwards this proceeding became a precedent which developed into the system just described. Such I believe was the origin of divorce as we understand the word in England.

The object of the ministry in introducing the Divorce Act of 1857 was, according to its promoters, to extend to the people at large the privileges which, owing to expense, were only available to the nobility before that time. One of the chief contentions of the Attorney-General was that the Act made no alteration in the existing law, but only simplified the procedure. The one extension which he admitted it gave, was the power it bestowed on women of obtaining a divorce for adultery coupled with cruelty, or desertion for two years, instead of only for adultery coupled with bigamy or incest, as was the old practice. It was largely round this rock that the controversy raged. In the year 1850 commissioners had been appointed, of which commission Lord Redesdale and Mr. Walpole were prominent members, to inquire into the condition of the Marriage and Divorce laws. They reported in 1852; and in 1854 a Bill was contemplated by Lord Aberdeen's Government (of which Mr. Gladstone was a member) to deal with the recommendations of the commissioners. This concurrence of Mr. Gladstone in the principle of divorce *a vinculo* when in office was a source of considerable embarrassment to him in the debates of 1857. He, however, totally emancipated himself from his former opinions, which he declared were not matured by close study at that time, and set himself to defeat the measure of 1857 on every ground. Many different lines of opposition were taken up over the committee stage of the measure. Some of the more noteworthy features of this opposition were based on the fact that the procedure would be still so costly as only to be available to the rich; on the evil that it gave no facilities to the poor to approach the local courts of Quarter Sessions for the same relief as was afforded in the old local Diocesan Courts; on the statement that divorce *mensa et thoro*, or judicial separation, as it was now to be called, was preferable to divorce *a vinculo*; on the contention that guilty parties should not be permitted to marry; on (and this was the most important of all) the broad ground that *the Bill before the House differed in spirit from the law of other countries, and notably of Scotland, in that it placed an uneven and unjust measure on the relative culpability of male and female matrimonial offences; that cruelty of itself, or conviction for crime, coupled with sentence of penal servitude, if not adultery alone, should be a reason for giving divorce to the woman as against her husband, as well as adultery coupled with any circumstances of peculiar aggravation.* It is curious to notice that those persons who were from the first either totally opposed to the principle of divorce at all, or who opposed on the ostensible ground that the matter required far more careful con-

sideration by Parliament, were the same who advocated with the greatest persistence and diligence every form of amendment which would render the position of the woman more nearly assimilated in the Act to that of the man. This is so important a feature in the debate, that it is necessary to go closer into the points of difference that existed between the parties to this Act. The Government contended that, first, they were only transferring to a new court the authority as exercised by the House of Lords and Ecclesiastical Courts; that they did not wish to alter the existing precedents on the subject of divorce, except that they made cruelty or desertion for two years a ground for divorce on the part of the woman. As a matter of fact, the alterations they were making were really very considerable in the new machinery which the legislation entailed. This was very clearly manifested in the debates on the second reading of the Bill, which passed, however, by 111 majority in a House of 305 members.

The Attorney-General argued that the Bill had come down from the Lords having been sanctioned by the Episcopal Bench, and that, in fact, the presence in that House of the bishops in all former cases of procedure in divorce *privilegia* was a tacit sanction by the Church that divorce was not against the law of Christianity. A curious feature of these *privilegia* was, that the House of Lords always put into the Bill a clause that the guilty partner should not be allowed to remarry, which clause was always struck out in due course by the Commons.

Sir J. Bowyer, who objected strongly to the measure, said that it seemed a strange thing that, whereas a single judge could hang a man, it would now take two chief justices and a judge in ordinary to divorce him from his wife. He also said that it could not be a poor man's Bill, since the old separation *a mensa et thoro* of the Ecclesiastical Court used to cost £150 to £200, while these suits before the new Court would cost at least £200 to £400. Mr. Gladstone said: "I must confess there is no legend, there is no fiction, there is no speculation, however wild, that I should not deem it rational to admit it into my mind, rather than allow what I conceive to be one of the most degraded doctrines that can be propounded to civilised man, namely, that the legislature has the power to absolve a man from spiritual vows taken before God." He also said: "The *Reformatio Legum*, I must say, opens the floodgates and lets in divorce wholesale, it not only admits divorce for adultery, but admits it for desertion, for violence, and for long-continued strife. But in some respects it is better than the present Bill, because it does not violate the cardinal Christian principle of the equality of the sexes and the identity of rights between them, and because it manifests a bona-fide intention to treat adultery as a criminal offence."

"In Scotland," said the Solicitor-General; "divorce was allowed in cases of adultery or continuous desertion, and it does not appear that this facility produces those frightful consequences which were apprehended by the opponents of this Bill." Sir G. Grey said, speaking of the effect of illegitimate offspring, "On the other hand, the adultery of the husband has no such necessary consequences, and for this reason, if for no other, I doubt if we should allow the woman to obtain a divorce equally with the man." And, speaking of collusion, he says, "No woman, or barely one, would, because she and her husband could not live happily together, commit adultery to obtain a divorce; but I fear there are many men who would not scruple to adopt this method."

One of the most controverted points in the debate was the question of the right of remarriage of guilty parties, and the exemption which should be made to the clergy from being compelled to marry them. A petition from nine hundred of the clergy was presented against the measure, and a compromise was effected to the effect that it should be optional to the clergy to refuse to marry the parties, but that the parties might be married in the parish church if they could find a clergyman to perform the duty. So great, indeed, was Mr. Gladstone's opposition to the measure that he said "he conceived it was incumbent on those who objected to the measure to attend night after night and week after week to debate line by line and word by word, if necessary, the details of a Bill of such importance." A strong attempt was made to give the Court of Quarter Sessions the right of decreeing judicial separations, which separations were to be of the form of the old divorces of a *mensa et thoro*, and carried with them the right to apply for alimony. This amendment was thrown out by the Lords, who only allowed this suit to be instituted before the judges of Quarter Sessions; the House of Lords also threw out a most important amendment of the House of Commons to the effect that "*Adultery under the conjugal roof*" should be a ground for divorce on the part of the wife. Speaking of judicial separations, which were advocated by Mr. Gladstone and others as a method for providing for temporary estrangements, Lord Palmerston said, "The position in which man and wife were placed by these judicial separations was a most objectionable one, and if marriage was dissolved at all he thought it should be dissolved altogether. He thought that parting man and wife in this way placed both of them in situations of great temptation, where they were liable to form connections which it was not desirable to encourage." Mr. Drummond moved in committee that adultery alone on the part of the man should be a ground for divorce. He said, "That House was a body of men legislating for women, and they had a code of their own invention, and for their own purposes, contrived to establish the general notion that unchastity in a man was a

much less evil than unchastity in a woman . . . The hon. member for Hertfordshire, Mr. Pullar, said the other day that there ought to be a divorce à vinculo the moment there was adultery, because adultery itself was a dissolution of marriage. If that was so, he would ask how many men in that house were married ? ”

Mr. Gladstone said, “Take the case of a person who committed adultery with his neighbour’s wife: the guilty woman is divorced by her husband, but the adulterer remains linked to his wife, who has no means of liberating herself from him. The direct operation of your laws in that case is, that you put a premium on his adding either desertion or cruelty to his adultery, in order that he may bring himself within the scope of the law, and thereby may become qualified for a union with the guilty object of his desires ; ” and speaking of cruelty he said, “Cruelty for which divorce is to be given in those courts must import danger to life, limb, or health, or a reasonable apprehension of such danger. Is that the only kind of cruelty which prevails in civilised society ? I say your enumeration of cases, so far from constituting a law, merely supplies a list of three or four of the most aggravated forms of the evil.” And, again, “It appears to me that the Bill proceeds on an estimate, either false or inadequate, of the mode in which temptation operates on parties guilty of adultery, according as they are men or women. I believe that a very limited portion of the offences committed by women are due to the more influence of sensual passion. You are now going to lay down the principle that divorce shall be made applicable to all classes of society. We know that the power arising from usage, tradition, and social position differs immensely according to the persons you have in view. You can inflict punishment through the medium of public opinion on the higher classes of society which you cannot inflict on the lower classes.” Mr. Henley said “that the vast inconvenience to a woman of having her home destroyed was a security that she would not abuse her power of applying for a divorce.” The Lord Advocate, who was challenged to defend the principle of the Scotch law, stated he was of opinion that the right of the two parties ought to be equal, because there was this counteracting balance, that nothing but absolute extremity would induce the wife to apply for the remedy. In Scotland the proportion of divorces was as three to two ; out of seventeen cases in a year in a population of two millions, seven were applications from wives and ten from husbands ; out of one hundred and seventy-five cases of divorce seventy-three were at the instance of the wife, and one hundred and two at the instance of the husband. Mr. Newdegate said, “As to himself, he unfeignedly pronounced this to be a most cowardly Bill, for, if he was capable of interpreting the fundamental principle of the English law, it was directed to protect the weak against the strong, while this Bill refused to give the

redress to the weak which it gave to the strong." Lastly, one of the strongest protests was made against the inequalities of the measure as affecting men and women in a minute signed by Lords Hutchinson, Harrington, Lyndhurst, Talbot de Malahide, and Helmore, which is printed in extenso in Hansard, 196, vol. for year 1857, page 229. This protest should be read by all persons who are interested in the question of women's disabilities before the law.

There is, and always will be, three distinct codes which regulate the ideas of society on the marriage question. 1st, there is the legal or purely civil aspect; this aspect will have greatest prevalence with the masses generally, who look to this law as a general criterion of ethics. 2nd, there is the religious aspect of the question; this view will appeal also to a very large body; and, indeed, in France, where the new Divorce law has come into existence, it is a fact that no persons of good social standing would use its provisions and contract a second marriage after divorce, without being aware that nine-tenths of his or her social equals would refuse, on the score of the Roman Catholic religion, to recognise their remarriage. 3rd, there is the social problem which divorce involves—the difficult question of the status of children in a divorced home, and the restraints, which Mr. Gladstone eloquently alluded to, as pertaining to the machinery of the unwritten laws of society. Now, no one of these three sets of laws absolutely tally; they are often, in fact, mutually destructive; and a further difficulty lies in the fact that their application becomes widely different according to the class you apply them to. Among the wealthy, for instance, the custody and care of children presents less difficulties than among the poor, where the adultery or misconduct of the parties is less necessarily evident, and less immediately destructive to the home. Among the poorer classes, where so many other hardships have to be contended with, the adultery or cruelty of either party aims a heavy material blow at the family; far more so than among what are called comfortably circumstanced people. These are only some of the immense difficulties to be provided for. It cannot be denied, however, by anybody who will study this debate, that the legislature failed to arrive at what the Attorney-General called the "end all" of legislation on this matter. It was difficult enough to get over the strong oppositions of the Church party to divorce at all, and it must be admitted that once that the House accepted the principle of the Bill on its second reading, the efforts of the Church party were directed to rendering the scandalous inequalities of the measure less harmful by placing women and men on a more equal footing.

It is curious to note the latent Catholicism which underlies even to-day the religious feelings of the English people. The old Ecclesiastical Courts were but sparingly touched by the Reformation; names

were altered, but the procedure remained. The Protestantism of England never attained the civil proportion it did in Germany, and consequently a divorce system, based on German methods, or even Scotch ideas, was peculiarly repugnant to English High Church doctrines. In Germany, Luther distinctly declared marriage to be only a civil contract, dissoluble therefore like any other contract; and if in Scotland a greater sanctity of ideas was accorded to marriage by the early reformers, they never for one moment accepted the idea of the Roman Sacrament and indissolubility of marriage. Even to-day in England a large body of the clergy would refuse to marry divorced persons, and the opinion of a large section of the public would be on their side:

This unfortunate conflict of English ideas on the subject as manifested in the three distinct codes I have alluded to is, that individuals fail in moments of temptation to realise the real bearing of the law. Divorce at present is the *perquisite* of the man, on the same principle that the married woman is still in the operation of the law only the man's "chattel," the "femme sole" being the legal expression of the anomaly of the converse condition. The English law empowers a man, however monstrous his conduct may have been, however great his cruelty, desertion, or adultery, to turn his wife out into the street and separate her from every intercourse with her children, and leave her to starve in a workhouse if, in a moment of weakness, she forgets her marriage vow: No act of the husband's entitles the woman to plead in her defence, no number of years of forbearance, or of much trial fidelity gives her protection. She may be turned into the street at an hour's notice, while before the law she has absolutely no remedy.

Such is the Divorce Act of 1857. The old Ecclesiastical Court, which was a Court of Equity as well as of Justice, would not have allowed this. Again, under the present law, a woman who has been cruelly treated or deserted by her husband, or who has been subjected to his open and continual adultery, even under the conjugal roof, is unable to obtain a divorce unless her husband has been guilty of cruelty or desertion as well as the adultery; and if he has been guilty of only one of these offences, however aggravated the form, she can only obtain a judicial separation; while the husband, unless he has committed adultery, can continue to dog the wretched woman's footsteps day by day and year by year, until he can obtain some evidence of adultery against her. During all this time the woman, who may have been brought up in the comfortable happy home of her parents, may have lost her relations, and be obliged to live on the alimony the court allows, which, even if she have children to support, is but one-third of the husband's income. The fact is, that wife-beating, in its most aggravated form, is child's play, com-

pared to this woman's fate. Here is a woman who has established the strongest case against the man who was bound to protect her, left in a position of the greatest difficulty, viewed askance by the world for being a separated woman, and dependent on the kindness of others, with no real home. If she ventures to form even a friendship with a man such as would be perfectly allowable so long as she lived in her husband's house, she is liable to be dragged up by this guilty husband in a divorce court on suspicion, and called upon to defend her name against any charge, however unfounded.

If my reader think that these are imaginary instances of the application of the Act of 1857, he has not had much experience of the silent tragedies of many women's lives, nor has he an accurate knowledge of the depths to which man's brutality can descend. It was in vain that Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Henley, Mr. Napier, Mr. Drummond, and others in the House of Commons, endeavoured to save a generation of Englishwomen from the vilest oppression, such as the worst days of the Spanish Inquisition never invented. It would be a fitting act of the Premier's great career, if at its close he were in a future session of Parliament to bring in a short measure to embody some of the amendments to his Act which he fought for so boldly and so resolutely, and with such remarkable perception, in his prime.

I am not going to enter into the question of the merits of divorce in the abstract. That is a principle which has been admitted into the English law, never to be repealed. It is true that under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, wives of the labouring class have the power of obtaining judicial separation from cruel husbands; but what advantage is a judicial separation to the women? It means among the lower class persecution by the man's relations, starvation and the loss of a home, furniture, and everything. It is a pity the legislation did not see the truth of Lord Palmerston's remarks on judicial separation that I have quoted, and on the humane principle embodied in the new French Act, which allows judicial separation (after I care not how many years, as a goal to live for), to be convertible into divorces *à vinculo*. The abominable cruelty of the *separation de corps et bien* was the one lever which obtained the passage of M. Naquet's Bill in the French Chambers, and it will only be by exposing the disadvantage which the woman is placed in by the English law which will compel the legislature to grant her tardy justice. According to the French Act, and it is drawn on very reasonable lines, the woman can obtain a divorce from her husband for a crime and loss of civil rights. In England, a woman cannot even divorce a man who is condemned to penal servitude for life, or is a raving lunatic.

It must not be supposed that the French Code makes matters easy for applicants for a divorce. The question of the division of property, the custody of children and the three years' probational period attached to judicial separation before a divorce can be applied for, renders divorce anything but a pleasing prospect. The principle of the measure is first to place the man and the woman on equal terms before the law; secondly, to treat judicial separations as periods of long probation, to afford time for reconciliation. It is distinctly a humane act, and instead of surrounding the Court with restrictions, it gives the judge full powers to decide on the merits of the cross pleadings, and give a decree to the injured party or to refuse the application on its merits.

One of the great faults of the English law is that it endeavours to take on its shoulders the burden of the "social law." It affects to regard divorce as a misdemeanour, whereas it is notorious that in more than half the divorce suits that come into our courts, the respondent is as anxious that the case should succeed as the petitioner. The whole paraphernalia of the Queen's Proctor is a survival of the Ecclesiastical Beadleocracy of Doctors' Commons. As the Attorney-General admitted, the divorce law is simply the crystalised procedure of those old institutions. Another misconception of this legislation is the idea that pervades the Divorce Act that adultery is the only matrimonial offence of first significance, whereas, as Mr. Gladstone repeatedly urged, the cruelty practised in a house by the husband on his wife might be a more aggravating evil than repeated acts of transient adultery. The act in this respect displays a blind ignorance of domestic tragedies such as any legal practitioner in the Divorce Court is familiarly acquainted with. It is drawn in a spirit of male "grundivism," with the selfish object of ministering to a man's worst "jealousies," without attempting for one moment to give the woman equal claims over the fidelity of her husband. Moreover, its tendency is to create family gulfs, and to expose domestic horrors to the shame of at least two families, without providing any solution of the difficulties. The exposure of the weaknesses and disorders of married lives fill the daily papers, only too often to stamp the wretched couple with the mark of an abortive publication of their family horrors, while it leaves them for life chained to one another, either on the ground that one of the parties has unclean hands, or that the villainy of the husband is not sufficiently extensive. The act assumes that in such cases the law has done its duty when, after raking up every species of horrors, it simply dismisses the petition, or gives to the aggrieved woman the *damnosa hereditas* of a judicial separation. Englishmen are too much prone to turn their heads when a social problem which involves shame on the morals of our civilisation calls for their just and equitable decision. Like many

members in these debates, they argue that as these things affect only a small minority of the population, the matter in no way presses on our attention. Yet who of us that has lived in contact with the troubles of the masses does not know the thousands of instances in which the unjust inequality of the sexes before the law in marriage has wrought unfold misery on both the women and children of those wretched homes?

It is said that if divorce were accorded to women for the adultery of their husbands, or for cruelty or desertion without adultery, no household would be safe, that children would be left uncared for, and that we should resemble North Germany in our domestic laxity. It is easy to assert these things, yet Scotland is a proof to the contrary. Where there are no children to a marriage, what ground is there for refusing divorce to a woman who has an adulterous or cruel husband? Do our labouring classes never suffer in this respect? It is fortunate for them that the Divorce Court as it is to-day, with its antiquated machinery and costly procedure, is not within their reach. Before 1857 divorce was only attainable to the upper classes; by this Divorce Act of 1857 it was brought within the reach of the middle class; it is still absolutely beyond the means of the people at large. You cannot make a country moral by Act of Parliament; you can but place obstacles in the way of their excesses. It would be infinitely better to repeal the Divorce Act altogether than continue the injustices of the present law, which the judges are bound by hard and fast lines to administer in the Divorce Court. However hard a case may be—and the judges and counsel know how hard cases often are—they can by the law give no remedy; no loophole was left by the Act for the judges to establish equitable precedent. The practice of the old Court of Doctors' Commons was fastened on them like a coat of mail. So ridiculous is this law that insanity, though it has been decided that it is not a bar to divorce if the insanity supervene after the alleged acts of adultery, it is not a ground for divorce even if one of the parties manifested tendency to insanity at the date of the marriage, and becomes lunatic. Yet what stronger ground can you have for divorce than confirmed insanity? If the insane person were after years of care and treatment to recover, are you justified in giving this person, as the law does, the power to sue for restitution of conjugal right, which simply means the right to produce children who will be tainted with this terrible hereditary calamity.

So long as the legislature determines to consider adultery the only ground for divorce, and attempts to place, "by law," a stigma on certain conduct and certain acts which it is the province of society and the world to judge and condemn, so long our marriage laws will continue in a vicious circle. How demoralising also are the pro-

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

ceedings which are cast daily before the people, and how revolting the matter which you force the judges to carve and dissect before the public! In France there is a penalty of twenty thousand francs for publishing the details of divorce cases; in England they form the staple for the Sunday literature of the masses in the weekly press! Conceive also the feelings of respectable families and injured wives, who are compelled to plunge into this divorce lottery on the chance that the Court may consider their case proved, and who, after exposing to the public their most sensitive sores, are dismissed with no relief save that of a life-long judicial separation.

The humanitarianism which we preach is false to the core so long as the legislature permits these abuses to continue, and so long as the woman is left unequally weighted by the law, and so long as the State takes upon itself the task of inflicting so-called punishment which are considered boons by the guilty parties. Marriage is a civil contract by law, which ninety-nine persons out of every hundred wish to surround with all the sanctity of religion and the sanction of the Church. In England we are day by day becoming more and more demoralised by that false code of morality which the law dispenses. The effect of making men and women equal before the law instead of increasing divorce and reducing the respect for marriage and the ties of family, would preserve these virtues from contamination. No woman would lightly break up her home. In the words of Mr. Henley, it would be a weapon in her hand she would be loath to use. Every woman would have her remedy in her own hands instead of being as she is to-day, the day she marries, simply the domestic "chattel" of her husband. Among the lower classes the effect would be not less salutary; the woman who has at last been given the right to keep her earnings apart from the rapacity of a bad and drunken husband, would be immeasurably raised in men's respect when they felt that every act of conjugal infidelity, every burst of drunken rage, every conviction for felony, gave the woman the right to either a divorce, or a separation which lapse of time might entitle her to convert into a divorce. And with regard to collusion, *is it supposed that collusion does not exist to-day?* There are few cases that come into court on the woman's side where she would be able to get a divorce if the husband chose to lift his little finger to stop her obtaining it. The necessary cruelty or desertion is often added technically by the husband to his adultery, simply in order to qualify for his freedom.

As I said, the House of Lords struck out the one important amendment of the House of Commons, making adultery under the conjugal roof a ground of divorce. Desertion was defined to be wilful absence of the husband for a period of two years. Then, as regards cruelty, the cruelty must be danger to life and limb, or be

construed as such. Hard words, provocation of the worst description, drunkenness—none of these acts are cruelty in the eyes of the law. The conviction for a disgraceful crime is not a ground for divorce to either party, though, as I have shown, the opponents of the Bill tried hard to make it so. "Adultery with disgraceful or aggravating circumstances" was the last form of amendment that was fought for on this head, yet the Government would hear of nothing. Mr. Drummond tried hard to make cruelty alone a ground for divorce, but all of no avail.

It seems to me that there is only one loophole that has never been tried during the debate. The Attorney-General said, August 14th, "there was nothing in this Bill to affect the future action of Parliament. The right of a wife under aggravated circumstances not provided for in this Bill to apply to the Legislature (*i.e.* the House of Lords) for a divorce would remain wholly unaffected;" and Lord John Russell, in reply, stated, "As to any cases which may hereafter come before the House of Lords upon the petition of the husband or wife for divorce in particular instances, I think we may safely leave them to the discretion of that tribunal. Such cases might not occur more than once or twice in a century, but when they do, the House of Lords can deal with them as they think proper." One would certainly suppose from this that the intention of the Legislature was not to abolish the superior right of the House of Lords to try divorce cases on their merits, according to their ancient powers of equitable jurisdiction, but that, on the contrary, while the new court was bound by its cast-iron procedure, the House of Lords might still be appealed to to try individual cases of peculiar hardship, and thus preserve to the highest court the right to establish new precedents for the Divorce Courts. However this may be, it is an indisputable fact that the time is not far distant when women will raise an effective outcry against the abuse of the present system.

In addition to their present rights, a woman ought to be entitled to a divorce—

1. For actual cruelty, or cruelty endangering life.
2. For desertion without reasonable excuse for two years and upwards.
3. For adultery committed by her husband in her home, or under disgraceful or aggravating circumstances.
4. For the conviction and sentence of her husband to a term of five years' penal servitude, or upwards, for crime.

Either party should be entitled to a divorce on proof of incurable insanity which has existed for two years.

The Judge orders the children to be taken out of the custody of the guilty party and placed with the innocent parent; compels the father to maintain them, but the amount fixed is always small.

You have besides the children of the marriage to consider. To provide for them by boarding them out, like paupers, on one or the other of the parties to the suit, is no solution of their future. The very disabilities which you attach to the divorced or separated parties remain as a stigma on and injury to the innocent children. In France they remain, even after divorce, the joint property of the parents. How can you eternally disgrace the mother or ostracise the father without affecting them? A home with immoral or disgraceful surroundings of strife and contention has ceased to be a possibility for them. Why perpetrate on them the further evil of accentuating the disadvantages they have inherited? Surely you can leave it to the family and the social circle of a man's or woman's friends to deal out the disgrace, which you endeavour brutally to fix on the offending party in a law court! By this means you deaden family feeling; you render the middle and lower class of England more brutal and insensitive than before, while you inflict an amount of pain and mortification on a whole host of people who have done no wrong save that their family names are involved in these public ordeals. As Don Quixote says somewhere, "Let that be done decently which decency deems should decently be done." Yet our Divorce Court of to-day is as savage and barbarous an institution ethically as the fixing up on spikes of the heads of criminals was in old days on London Bridge. You have abolished the one abomination; is it not time that, in this nineteenth century, you should abolish this other?

GEORGE H. LEWIS.

RECENT PROGRESS IN ELECTRICITY.

It was in 1846 that gas was introduced in my native place, Stuttgart; and a number of old women who had been employed by the Town Council to light and trim the ancient oil lamps walked in procession through the streets of the town, bitterly complaining that they had been robbed of their bread and butter by the new invention. The complainants to-day are the directors of gas companies and their shareholders. But the shouts and yells of the old lamplighters in Stuttgart did no more bring back the ancient oil lamps than the deprecations of directors and shareholders of gas companies will prevent the electric light from ousting gas as a lighting material. And who but they will regret it? All will rejoice at the prospect of living, breathing, and working in rooms whose atmosphere is no longer vitiated by products of combustion, such as carbon dioxide, sulphur dioxide, and others, and where the temperature is no longer artificially raised by the combustion of 85 per cent. of heat-giving gases contained in ordinary coal gas, which we burn for the sake of its 12.15 per cent. of heavy light-giving hydrocarbons. It was a tempting task, promising a golden harvest, to find a suitable substitute for it; and in no branch of applied electricity has so much ingenuity been displayed as in the construction of the various lamps.

Generators.—The idea of employing electricity for the production of light is by no means a modern one. As early as 1746 Dr. Watson made use of the electric light for purposes of illumination; and Sir Humphrey Davy obtained—by means of a battery of 2,000 elements, the poles of which were connected with two carbon points—a dazzling and continuous light without any perceptible noise. The reason why the electric light has remained a lecture experiment for such a long time lay in the insufficiency of the available electric sources. The galvanic battery does not give a sufficiently powerful current, unless the number of elements used is so large that the question of economy becomes an insurmountable obstacle. It was only when the invention of the dynamo machine permitted the generation of powerful electric currents under less costly conditions, that electric illumination came within the range of practical questions. The principle of the dynamo machine was discovered by Faraday in 1830. He found that when a permanent magnet acts upon a closed spiral circuit, a current, called an induction current, is generated in that circuit.

Every dynamo consists of two fundamental indispensable parts, the field magnet and the armature. The armature generally is a ring having an iron core surrounded with copper wire. By moving it with great speed between the field magnets (permanent, or, better,

electro-magnets), an electric current is generated in the copper wire spirals of the armature. This current is collected by a number of thin, flexible strips of copper (copper brushes), and from these is conducted into the external circuit. For one-half of the revolution of the armature the current generated in each coil flows in one direction; for the second half its direction is exactly opposite. Machines which use these two opposite currents without any further modification are called alternating-current machines. By an ingenious mechanical contrivance, called a commutator, the second half of the current can be made to assume the same direction as the first half, and thus we get a continuous-current machine. Both kinds are used as light machines, although the tendency has been of late to give preference to the latter; in every case, however, the individual requirements of the application for which the machine is destined must decide the choice. The merit of having first constructed a thoroughly practical dynamo undoubtedly belongs to Gramme, for although the principle of the Gramme ring was discovered by Pacinotti, he did not realise the importance of his discovery, leaving to Gramme the practical and industrial development of his principle.

The Gramme machine is the prototype of all our present dynamos. The principle has remained the same, the improvements merely consisting of a gradual perfection in the details of construction. And in this direction fifteen years have worked marvels. What a difference between the first Gramme machine of 1870 and the compound dynamos manufactured by Schucker, of Nuremberg, and Messrs. Crompton, of Chelmsford! Nothing could surpass the elegance and solidity of construction, and at the same time the regularity of movement, of these machines. All the details are worked out with mathematical accuracy. No wonder that the practical result is excellent, and that they transform into electricity more than 90 per cent. of the work expended. The compound machine itself constitutes one of the most important advances made within the last three years, and a few words concerning it must necessarily find their place here. To Mr Kapp, of Messrs. Crompton & Co., belongs the credit of having applied the principle to this machine, whose peculiarity consists in the employment of a combined system of main and shunt coils (a current branching off from any given point of a main circuit is called a shunt or derived current, and a coil wound with the wire thus branching off is a shunt coil); and the object of this arrangement is to obtain a constant electro-motive force in the external circuit of the machine. The Vienna Exhibition of 1883 first illustrated on a large scale the importance of this improvement, which makes it possible to turn on or off any number of incandescent lamps in one circuit without special apparatus for the regulation of the current. The practical electricians have not been slow to recognise the advantages of this system, and nearly all the leading firms have adapted it to their machines.

How is it, then, many a reader of this article will ask, that in spite of all the recent perfections and improvements of the electric generating machines, that important—we may call it that burning—question of electric lighting has not made the rapid progress which was predicted for it at the outset? The answer is that in this country, where gas is so cheap, the electric light is as yet too expensive, and therefore only recommends itself for installations where the question of expense is of secondary importance—for instance, for the illumination of clubs, theatres, large shops, railway stations, and of public buildings. A general adaptation of electric light to domestic purposes is, in my opinion, contingent upon an entire change in the mode of production of electricity. This seems a startling assertion, but on closer scrutiny it will not be found so surprising after all. Under the present system we convert heat into work by a boiler and a steam-engine, and the work thus generated is transmuted into electricity by means of a dynamo. Now, let our apparatus be ever so perfect, a certain loss is unavoidable in each of these two conversions of energy; the loss is a double one, and this is what makes electricity expensive. With cheaper electricity we might not only light our houses, but we might make soda by electrolytical decomposition of common salt—aluminium, magnesium, zinc, copper, nay, even iron, by direct current action on the impure salts of these metals, such as we find them in nature, or prepare them by treatment of the naturally occurring ores with acids. These instances of electrolytical action are singled out here from innumerable others in order to direct the attention of practical men towards a branch of applied electricity which has hitherto been comparatively neglected. But, the reader will ask, if you do not want to pass through the intermediary stage of work, and if primary batteries are inadmissible on account of their expensiveness, how will you generate your electricity?

There remains one way, namely, direct conversion of heat into that particular form of energy, and that this is feasible is shown by the thermo-electric battery. The principle of the thermo-electric battery was discovered in 1821 by Professor Seebeck, of Berlin. He found that on soldering together two electrically opposed metals and heating the soldering, an electric current was generated. A considerable number of thermo-electric batteries have been constructed since that discovery, amongst which Clamond's was the most successful; but they all suffered from the same defect—they gave a very low electromotive force, and were therefore unfit for any work where electromotive force as well as quantity is required; in fact, the only application they found in practice was galvanoplastic.

An improvement upon Clamond's apparatus, as far as electromotive force is concerned, is Lautensack's thermopyle. It has the form of a stove, and can be used as such; its electromotive force is considerable, and the consumption of fuel at the same time moderate.

A stove of this description might be placed in the basement of a house, the heat it gives off might be used for heating the house with hot air pipes, and the current generated either used for domestic lighting purposes or for driving a small motor for doing domestic work. But even Lautensack's apparatus, though showing a decided improvement in the right direction, does not give sufficient current for more than one or two ordinary Swan lamps; it does not present anything like a complete solution of the most important question of practical electricity, namely, a simpler and cheaper mode of generating electricity; but it marks a decided advance, and points to the possibility of such a solution being arrived at. One more word on this subject. If it is possible to make the use indicated of heat artificially produced, why should we not succeed in directly converting solar heat into electricity? Surely this can only be a question of constructive detail, and who can doubt that the result would amply repay the investigator for all his exertions, even for a lifelong devotion to the problem? We may go farther still; we know from Graham Bell and Summer Tainter's investigations that certain substances, such as selenium, tellurium, lamp-black, and many others, are extremely sensitive to the influence of light, and that this influence manifests itself by modifying the electrical resistance of these substances. This points to the conclusion that light, as well as heat, is available for conversion into electricity, and leaves no reasonable doubt that by the hands of a skilful manipulator both these forms of energy will, at no distant date, be put to practical use.

Lamps.—Let us now proceed to the subject of electric lamps. The remark which has been made with regard to generating machines applies to this class of apparatus: the principles have remained the same, only the details of construction have been improved. Two kinds of lamps, the arc and the incandescent, still claim attention. That a vast amelioration has taken place in the quality of the arc light, was clearly shown at the Vienna Exhibition. Not one of the lamps exhibited at the Crystal Palace in '82 gave a steady light for any length of time, and here the Zipernowski, the Siemens, and the Pillsen lamps seemed to satisfy all reasonable demands, both as regards steadiness and brilliancy. We have not very far to look for the reasons of this improvement; it is due to the great care bestowed by these firms upon the construction of their generating machines and lamps, and upon the selection of their carbons.

Many of our English companies seem to have overlooked these details; they have been more or less engaged in speculative business, in founding branches and selling their patents; they have sent inferior articles to the market, and thereby have created a prejudice in the public mind which it will take some time to overcome. One glance at the Zipernowski lamp will show what a good arc lamp ought to be like—what minute attention has to be paid to all the parts

of the mechanism in order to obtain a steady light. The objection that such an apparatus is too expensive cannot be entertained for one moment, for it will outlast ten ordinary lamps, and will not require those frequent repairs which are one of the greatest objections to the use of arc lamps. It is as simple as it is elegant, and a short description, illustrating at the same time the principle on which all arc lamps are constructed, must naturally find its place here. It has one solenoid only, whose soft iron core is attached to a guiding frame, which carries a brake for the clamping of a toothed wheel. The upper carbon is attached to a rackwork, which gears in with the toothed wheel mentioned above. The current enters through the lower fixed carbon-holder, which, under normal conditions, is kept apart from the upper one; the current, therefore, passes into the solenoid, the soft iron core is attracted, the guiding frame, which has the form of a parallelogram, is pulled down on one side, raised on the opposite side which carries the brake, the toothed wheel and the rackwork are released, the positive carbon descends, and the arc is formed. The current now passes through the carbons until, through their waste, the resistance becomes too great, when the former operation is repeated, and the positive carbon is again sufficiently lowered for the formation of the arc.

The Brush lamp, the first of all the arc lamps used for large installations, has not made good use of the start it had of its younger competitors; no alterations or improvements have been effected in its rather clumsy regulating apparatus, and the result is as little satisfactory now as it was at the Crystal Palace three years ago. That these lamps are still extensively used in the United States may be accounted for by the indisputable fact that Americans are not nearly as exacting as we are with regard to the steadiness of the light, and that they are accustomed to a much rougher type of machines and apparatus generally.

The Gramme lamp, the use of which is almost entirely restricted to France and Spain, has a most complicated regulating mechanism, and on that account requires constant overhauling and repairing. It has never obtained a footing in this country. The same may be said of the Cance lamp, a small type of which is intended for domestic lighting, giving from 150 to 200 candles. The light of the lamp is anything but steady, and it seems totally unfit for the purpose named.

The Siemens lamp gives a fairly steady light, and is extensively used on the Continent.

The least complicated perhaps, as regards its construction, and one of the most efficient, is the Pilsen lamp. It is extensively used all over the Continent and also in this country, and its regulating mechanism is of so simple a nature that it will burn for years in places such as flour-mills, chemical works and others, where any other arc lamp would be out of order in a few months.

If we mention the Crompton, Weston, and Gùlcher lamps, we have pretty nearly exhausted the list of arc lamps now in use. It remains for us, after weighing the claims and individual performances of the different lamps, to consider the prospects of the whole system. It is generally understood that the arc lamp is to replace gas in the illumination of public thoroughfares and of large areas, while for domestic lighting the incandescent lamp is called upon to perform that task. The question is whether the results hitherto obtained with the arc lamp hold out the prospect of a complete and satisfactory solution of this problem. I am inclined to doubt it, for the following reasons: first of all, the arc lamp requires too much personal attention and supervision ever to become economical; the carbons must be renewed every day; the lamp must for this purpose either be lowered and raised, or the attendant must mount a ladder, and these manipulations naturally expose the lamp to an extra amount of risk and danger, especially in the hands of unskilled persons. Secondly, good carbon points are very expensive and also very difficult to procure, and an arc lamp which burns inferior carbons is worse than useless; for the light flickers in a manner most injurious to the eyesight. Thirdly, the regulating apparatus, be it ever so simple and perfect, very often gets out of order, and requires frequent repairs. Fourthly, every irregularity in the movement, not only of the driving engine, but also of the generating dynamo, causes a flickering of the lamp. It is more than doubtful whether all these objections will ever be removed; the only thing holding out a remote promise that one of these difficulties might be overcome, is the success of an experiment of burning an arc lamp under water. This experiment proves that the arc light can be produced by mere incandescence, without combustion of the carbons, and points to the possibility of constructing an arc lamp in which the carbons would last for a much longer period; their waste would then be a consequence of disintegration and no longer of rapid combustion. It would, however, be a great mistake to conclude from the objections urged above that the arc light is unfit for practical purposes; it will have a proper sphere assigned to it, within which no other light will be able to compete with it. This sphere is the illumination of large open spaces, parks, and recreation grounds, of lighthouses, and, with the help of projectors, of military and naval operations.

That the arc lamp has proved a partial success can, I think, no longer be doubted; and now how about the incandescent lamp? The two reasons which have hitherto stood in the way of a general adaptation of the incandescent lamp are the expense of installation and of working, and the inferior efficiency of the common lamp. The first of these objections has been already considered at length in this article; it will only altogether disappear on a cheaper mode of generating electricity being introduced; for it is to be feared that even with central lighting stations electric light will not at present be able

to compete in price with gas. On considering the second objection we find that the last two years have brought about a great improvement: the Swan, the Woodhouse and Rawson, and last, though not least, the Bernstein lamp, give an excellent light, and are daily gaining favour and ground for practical application. The latter lamp having only been in the market for the last two years, and differing as it does materially from all other incandescent lamps, deserves a few words of description. The ordinary incandescent lamp has a very fine carbon filament with a very small illuminating surface. The Bernstein lamp employs a hollow carbon cylinder, made by carbonising a thin hollow ribbon of woven silk, and has a comparatively large illuminating surface. As a high candle-power lamp it is superior to most of the other lamps, and is eminently fitted for street-lighting and illumination of large spaces.

Now that the speculative wave has subsided, and English companies are compelled to make their profits by manufacturing and by doing legitimate business, we find incandescent lighting steadily increasing. It has not taken the world by storm, it has not yet ousted gas; but it has been and is being adopted in many theatres, clubs, public buildings, large warehouses and factories, and by nearly all our large steamship companies. A number of collieries employ electric light, but the progress in this direction is very slow, which is the more to be regretted as the use of an incandescent safety lamp would ensure the safety of many hundreds of miners. In 1880 four hundred and ninety-nine persons were killed by explosions of fire-damp in Great Britain, and it is to be hoped that before long the adoption of electric lighting for coal-mines will be made compulsory by Act of Parliament.

Telephones.—It is difficult to realise the fact that it is only eight years since the telephone was invented. It has taken such firm hold of our wants and habits, it has made itself so useful—we may almost say indispensable—that we look upon it as an old servant who has been with us a long time, and whose services we could ill afford to spare. It might be thought that an apparatus so well known and so extensively used as the telephone required no further description, but for the better understanding of the following pages and for those readers who are not electricians, a few words concerning the telephone will not be considered out of place. The telephone is an instrument for the transmission of sound to a distance. All telephones can be divided into two distinct classes: magnetic telephones and battery telephones. The principle of the magnetic telephone was discovered by Reiss as early as 1860, but the discovery was not turned to practical account till sixteen years later by Graham Bell. In the ordinary Bell transmitter a magnetic bar which carries a coil wound with copper wire is placed at a short distance behind a thin metallic plate. On speaking before the mouthpiece of the telephone the plate

vibrates, alternately approaching the coil or withdrawing from it. These alternate movements give rise to induced undulatory currents in the coil, and these currents are by two conducting wires conveyed to a second telephone, called the receiver, which transforms them again into sonorous vibrations. In the battery telephone—and all microphonic transmitters belong to this class—the vibrations of the metallic membrane produce variations of contact between a carbon point and a carbon disc, and these variations are no longer utilised to produce currents, but to vary the strength of those emanating from a constant source, the battery. In magnetic telephones the sending instrument acts like a real generator of electricity; the mechanical work of the voice is only partly transformed into induction currents which, on passing into the receiver, make it vibrate synchronically with the membrane of the sending telephone. The currents sent along the line must, therefore, have a limited intensity, and in no case will the receiver be able to emit sounds of the same intensity as those emitted before the transmitter. The case is different with battery transmitters; their vibrations no longer produce currents, but only modify those generated by the battery, and under these conditions the receiver can repeat with greater intensity the sounds emitted before the transmitter. The superiority of the microphonic transmitter is now a recognised fact. Nearly all the systems in use at the present time employ this kind of apparatus, which has ousted the magnetic transmitter, whilst the receiver almost in every case has remained the ordinary Bell.

An excellent instrument, admirably adapted for transmission of speech, is the Berliner transmitter. It consists of a small hard carbon point touching a small equally hard carbon disc, which is fastened to a metallic membrane, thus constituting a microphonic contact without friction. The circular membrane is only fixed at one point to the microphone case; and, on closing the case, is pressed against the cover by a spring, which is, together with the carbon disc, fastened to the membrane. This spring serves not only as a conductor between the carbon disc and the induction coil, but also as a regulator, in case of the vibrations of the membrane being too strong or not strong enough. This instrument is little known in England, but it is extensively used in America and in Germany, and gives excellent results. Conversation can be carried on by means of it without raising the voice in the slightest degree, and every word is clearly heard even at a distance of ten or even twenty miles.

Another telephone worthy of note, on account of its extraordinary simplicity, is the phonophore of Dr. Wreden, of St. Petersburg. A small carbon point is attached to a lever, which at the other end carries a weight sufficient to make contact between the carbon point and a small carbon disc attached to a board made of cork. The sensitiveness of this simple instrument can be increased by screwing an

additional weight of the form of a small disc to the end of the lever. A similar board (*planchette*, as it is called) with four carbon contacts, is said to repeat the performance of a whole orchestra. The price of this instrument is only one-third of that of the ordinary telephone.

One of the best instruments for musical repetition is the telephone of the Vienna Telegraph and Telephone Company, which was, at the Vienna Exhibition, connected with the Imperial opera. It greatly resembles the Berliner transmitter; but instead of one carbon contact it has six. This of course greatly increases the sensitiveness of the instrument. Nothing could have surpassed the clearness with which the finale of the first act of Verdi's *Aida* was repeated. The solos, choruses, and instrumental music were so beautifully rendered that one felt very much inclined to join in the applause which on the fall of the curtain was transmitted from the opera. The same kind of transmitter was also used for another rather peculiar musical performance: a lady singing, at Baden, about twelve miles from Vienna, was accompanied by a man playing the zither at Korneuburg, about the same distance from Vienna, but on the opposite side of the Danube. The repetition itself was a perfect success, but the peculiar crackling noise of induction was only too audible, and greatly interfered with the performance. This troublesome noise of induction arises from the close proximity of telegraph wires to the telephonic conductors. The vibrations of the very powerful currents which are used for the working of the telegraph generate by induction in the telephone wires much stronger vibrations than the human voice can produce, and thus the transmission of speech is interfered with, and in some cases even rendered impossible by the clattering of the telegraphic apparatus. Of all the remedies suggested to overcome this difficulty, the only effective one has been found in the employment of a return wire. The action of the telegraph wires on the telephonic conductors is thus neutralised, as it takes place equally in both directions. Successful attempts have lately been made of long-distance telephoning; according to a statement apparently, resting on good authority, telephonic messages have been sent from New York to Chicago, a distance of 1,000 miles. This result is mainly due to the construction of the conductor. Instead of employing a thin steel wire of high resistance, a stout copper-plated steel core was used for conveying the messages, and the achievement may well be regarded as marking a new era in the development of telephonic communication.

Electrical transmission of energy.—Little, if any, progress has lately been made in the electrical transmission of mechanical work. Marcel Deprez by his experiments made in 1882 between Munich and Miesbach, a distance of fifty miles; in 1883 between Creil and Paris, five miles; and in 1882 between Ville and Grenoble, ten miles, has

demonstrated that it is possible to electrically transmit mechanical work to a distance, with a loss of from fifty to sixty per cent. of the original motive power, and there the question at present rests. There can be no doubt that the principle has been successfully established, but the practical result has in every instance been seriously hindered by mechanical difficulties which it will take some time to overcome.

Various applications.—Conspicuous amongst these applications, both for ingenuity and practical usefulness, is the electric boiler safety apparatus of Mr. Richard Schwarzkopff, of Berlin. By means of two plugs of an alloy fusible at a low temperature, electric connection is made, and an alarm bell rings, as soon as either the water in the boiler has reached a temperature above which it must not be heated, or the water level has become dangerously low. In this way the boiler is guarded against over-heating, and of course at the same time against excessive steam pressure, and also against accidents arising from want of water. This apparatus has been introduced in the German navy. Most ingenious and interesting are Dr. Boudet's electro-medical instruments; they are the common pulsometer, or sphygmophone; the cardiophone, for auscultation of the heart, and the myophone for auscultation of the muscles. The myograph traces the muscular contractions on a cylinder coated with smoked paper, and enables the observer accurately to measure the nervous excitability; and another instrument, the cleverest of all, allows of a direct measurement of the acuteness of hearing. Finally must be mentioned a set of apparatus constructed by Dr. Dvůrák, of Agram, throwing considerable light on the nature of electricity. At the Paris Electrical Exhibition of 1881, Mr. Rijkens showed a number of experiments proving that bodies set in vibrating motion in a liquid produced effects of attraction and repulsion like those produced by magnetic vibrations. Mr. Stroh very soon afterwards showed that vibrations of the air caused by sound gave exactly the same results; and Dr. Dvůrák, who has worked in the same direction, has constructed a number of the most ingenious instruments for illustrating these phenomena. He not only shows the effects of attraction and repulsion, but he also converts sonorous vibrations into a continuous current of air, just as electric vibrations are converted into a continuous electric current.

The enormous strides which the practical applications of electricity have made within the last few years are without precedent in the history of science. We may safely say that it was the Paris Exhibition of 1881 which first opened the eyes of the public to the vast importance of electrical appliances. The steady advance made since in nearly every branch of applied electricity points to the conclusion that before long we shall be dependent upon these appliances not only for our pleasures and comforts, but even for the necessities of daily life.

JULIUS MAYER.

BISMARCK: A RETROSPECT.

THE "aureole of unpopularity" which encircled Bismarck's brow during four short years of inaugural premiership has, to all appearance, vanished under the influence of unbroken success, making room throughout the world for a confiding deference to his capacity and forethought, that every year seems to intensify. It is he, in the belief of most Governments, who has preserved to them what never was more indispensable for their very existence—peace in Europe. With supreme adroitness, he avoids entanglements for himself and his country, bears many an affront patiently before retorting, keeps up the appearance of a good understanding after its substance has long passed away, but, when fairly engaged in diplomatic contention, lays out his field in a manner that insures success. People agree, therefore, that it is best to take him as he is. And it is in the nature of man when he has once accorded that favour to a fellow-creature, to "take him as he is," that he ends by liking him. Thus Bismarck, of all living men the most unlikely to succeed in the race after a worldwide popularity, is probably at this moment the best-liked man in either hemisphere.

His own countrymen have shown a decided indisposition to admit him among their household gods. To them he was, from the commencement of his political career, the very embodiment of what had gradually become the most objectionable type of Teuton existence—the unmitigated squireen or *Junker*, with his poverty and arrogance, with his hunger and thirst after position and good living, with his hatred for the upstart Liberal burgher class. "Away with the cities! I hope I may yet live to see them levelled to the ground." Is there not a ring of many centuries of social strife, so laboriously kept down by the reigning dynasty, in these stupendous words, which were pronounced by Bismarck in 1847, when among the leaders of the Conservatives in the first embryo Parliament of the Prussian monarchy? And if uncongenial to the generation of Prussians among whom he had grown up, how infinitely greater was the dislike against him of South Germans, more gifted, as a rule, by nature, to whom the name of Prussian is synonymous of all that is strait-laced and overweening and unnatural and—generally inconvenient.

Little of that sentiment remains among the Germans of the present day. Such strangers as have had the opportunity of observing the attitude of the nation during the late celebrations of his seventieth birthday agreed in declaring them to have been spontaneous, enthusiastic, and at times almost aggressive. Some tell us, to be sure, that the farther from Berlin the more gushing has been the ecstasy. The

electors of Professor Virchow and of Herr Löwe, in whose electoral districts a torchlight procession on the eve of Bismarck's birthday had to elbow their way through immense crowds, must have kept at home. The municipality of Berlin, a model body of civic administrators, sent a birthday letter to their "honorary citizen," but abstained, with proper self-respect, from tendering their congratulations through a deputation. No Berlin citizen of any importance had a hand in the management of the procession. Yet, if thousands kept aloof, tens of thousands shared the national enthusiasm—students of universities chiefly, but older men too, even in distrustful, Radical Berlin. And as for South Germany, where the gospel of Protection seems, perhaps, to be more firmly believed in than any other, we read of trains to Berlin taken by storm, banquets, processions, chorus-singing—of real, heartfelt, rapturous effervescence.

There cannot be a shadow of doubt that, to numberless non-Prussians at any rate, the new era of German Unity has brought a symbol of greatness not before known, and that they worship in Bismarck the hero who has given them a country to love, who has delivered them from the pettiness and self-satisfaction of Philistinism.

Now, if this be so—if, indeed, the countries of the world at large, and Germany in particular, acknowledge him almost affectionately as the leading statesman of the day, would it not be an interesting study to examine the degree of merit due to him personally, the character of the present Administration, and what lasting good or lasting evil may be expected from this new phase of European politics? The subject, through its weight and its bulk alike, excludes full treatment within the limits of an essay. Nevertheless, since it intertwines itself with nearly every other question of moment, a few remarks by an outsider may be acceptable.

None but the incorrigibly childish can be inclined to ascribe to good luck a prosperous career extending over near twenty-three years, spent under the fiercest glare of the world's sunshine. No minister of any age was more bitterly assailed or opposed, even at the Court of which he is now the acknowledged *major domus* in the manner of the Pepins and other *Thum-Meiers* of the Frankish monarchy. The King's brother, Prince Charles, detested the innovator whose opinions on the necessity of Austria being removed from membership in a remodelled German confederation had for years leaked out from the despatch-boxes of the Foreign Office. Even the *Junkers*, whose dauntless leader he had been before and after the revolutionary events of 1848, shrank instinctively from a man who could not be credited with veneration for the Holy Alliance. It is remembered in Berlin that, on the nomination of one of them, well at Court, a diplomatist of some standing, to the post of Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the new member of the Government confessed to his friends that he accepted the post *in spite* of Bismarck's

"foreign" policy and only in consideration of his contempt for parliamentarism. The Queen, on the other hand, brought up in principles of constitutional government, and strongly attached to the English alliance, viewed with horror the bold pugilist who was daily assailing, not the persons only of the people's representatives, but some of the very foundations of every parliamentary edifice. Yet fiercer was the animosity shown him on every occasion by the Princess Royal of England, whose father had early taught her that a throne, to be safe, requires absolute solidity of institutions and agreement with the people, and who seriously trembled for the preservation of her children's future. Her husband expressed himself forcibly on a public occasion against some reactionary measures of the Government. As the Court, so the Liberal parties, so the people in general. When a fanatic, of the name of Kohn, attempted Bismarck's life in May, 1866, there were few persons who did not regret his failure. It may be said with truth that, for years, two men only understood a portion at least of his political views, and shared them. One was King William. Isolated as Herr von Bismarck was, he learned to rely implicitly on his sovereign's faithfulness, and has had no reason to regret his trust; for the King, though greatly his inferior in intellect, and far from unblest with Legitimist predilections, was as firmly convinced as his minister that the confederation of German States, and Prussia herself, might be swept away, unless placed upon a new footing, in one of those tornadoes which used periodically to blow across the Continent of Europe. Thus, the new departure was as much his own programme as Bismarck's, and although he started (in 1861) with a hankering after "moral" rather than material conquests, he gradually understood the necessity for war, and has of a certainty "taken kindly," as the saying is, to material conquests of no inconsiderable magnitude.

None, even among Bismarck's modern sycophants, would pretend that their hero was the inventor of German Unity. Passionately, though not over-wisely, had that ideal been striven after and suffered for by the best patriots in various parts of Fatherland, their vision becoming hazy just as often as they attempted to combine two opposite claims, that of a national texture, and that of a headship of Austria, which is non-German in a majority of its subjects, and alien in nearly all its interests. The Frankfort Parliament of 1848 marks the transition to a clear insight, inasmuch as its final performance, the Constitution of 1849, placed the new crown on the King of Prussia's head. When offered, it was haughtily declined under the applause of Bismarck and his friends. The King refused because its origin lay in a popular assembly; in Bismarck's eyes its chief defect was that Prussia would be dictated to by the minor states. It was not until later, in 1851, when appointed Prussian Ambassador to the Germanic Diet, chiefly because of his defence of the Treaty of Olmütz

which placed Prussia at the mercy of Austria, that he recognised the central point to be the necessity of thrusting Austria out of the Confederation. It is proved now that he was sagacious enough also to perceive that such a wrench would not lead to a permanent estrangement, but that Austria, removed once and for all from her incubus-like and dog-in-the-manger position within the federate body, would become, in her own interest and that of European peace, New Germany's permanent ally.

These, then, became the two purposes of his active life ever since the day when, at the age of thirty-six, he obtained a share of the responsibility in the management of affairs as ambassador in Frankfort: first, to transfer *Austria to a position in the East*, and then to bestow upon Fatherland *political Unity under Prussia, the royal prerogative in the latter remaining uncurtailed* so far as circumstances would allow. Thirty-four years have now elapsed. His opponents in his own country or out of it are at liberty to reiterate that he was born under a lucky star; that he merely took up the thread of German unification where the Frankfort Parliament of 1849 had let it drop; that anybody could have utilised such mighty armaments as those of Prussia with the same effect; that, given total disregard of principle or moral obligations, the result, in the hands of any political gamester, must have been what it was. There is something to be set against each of these assertions. For it was not the goddess of Fortune which pursued Bismarck in the ungainly shape of his former friend, that spiteful Prince Gortschakoff. The Frankfort Assembly had left the Austrian riddle unsolved, and apparently insoluble. There was no hand in the country firm or skilful enough, no brain sufficiently hard or enlightened as to the needs of the day—not the King's, not Count Armin's, nor certainly that of any other known to his contemporaries. And finally, when a public man so deftly gauges the mental capacities or extent of power of his antagonists—such as Count Beust, or Napoleon, or Earl Russell—that he knows exactly how far he can step with safety, then such a "gamester," however terrible the risks to which he may have exposed his country, is a great man. Complete unity of aims throughout, power given to carry them out, a wonderful absence of very serious mistakes, and finally a life sufficiently prolonged to admit of retrospection; in each of these respects the career of Bismarck resembles that of Mr. Disraeli.

The oft-told story of his diplomatic adventures at Frankfort, at Vienna, at Petersburg, and at Paris, and still more of his rulership in Prussia since 1862, and in Germany since 1866, has been uniform under two aspects. First, as already mentioned, in the stern continuity of his purposes. And secondly, in the mistaken view entertained regarding him at each successive period of his public life. Passing under review the whole career of this political phenomenon, you naturally pause before its strangest and its most humorous

feature, viz., that, although living under the closest inspection, he was misunderstood year after year. Who would, consequently, deny the possibility, at least of Bismarck's being so misunderstood, by friend and foe, at this present moment?

Whilst those despatches were written by him from Frankfort which Poschinger's researches have now exhumed, their writer was thought, by his partisans just as much as by his enemies, to be occupied solely with strengthening the "solidarity of Conservative interests" and the supremacy of Austria, or with spinning the rope of steel which was to strangle all parliaments in Germany. And yet we know positively at present that with increasing vigour day by day did he warn his Government against the scarcely concealed intention of Austria to "*avilir la Prusse d'abord et puis l'anéantir*" (Prince Schwarzenberg's famous saying in 1851); we observe with surprise how quickly Legitimist leanings disappear behind his own country's interests; we stand aghast at the iron sway obtained by so young a man over the self-conceit of a vacillating yet dogmatic and wilful King (Frederick William IV.). It was he whose advice, given in direct opposition to Bunsen's, led to the refusal by Prussia of the Western Alliance during the Crimean War. But he did not give this advice, as German Liberals then believed, out of subservience to the autocrat of the North, whose assistance his party humbly solicited in order to exterminate Liberalism. He persistently gave it to thwart Austria and to preserve Prussia (then in no brilliant military condition) from having to bear the brunt of Muscovite wrath, which he cunningly judged to be of more lasting importance in the coming struggles than the friendship of Western Europe. At a time when European politicians considered that he was the mouthpiece of schemers for a Russo-French alliance in his repeated and successful endeavours to gain Napoleon's goodwill, he was adroitly sounding the French Emperor's mind and character. He soon convinced himself that it was shallow and fantastic, and he built upon this conviction one of ~~the~~ ^{ambitious} designs which ever originated in a brain obsessed, some years later, first to Schleswig and then to Sadowa, with the "arbitrer of Europe," as Napoleon was then called, stolidly looking on! And what is one to say of the four years of parliamentary conflicts (1862 to 1866), during which no one doubted but that his object in life and his *raison d'être* consisted in a re-statement of the Prussian King on the absolute throne of his ancestors—a reaction from all that was progressive to the grossest abuses of despotism? All this time he was fighting a desperate battle against backstairs influences, which with true instinct were deprecating and counteracting his schemes of aggrandisement and national reorganisation. It is clear on looking back to that period which has left such indelible marks on the judgment of many well-meaning Liberals,

that his exaggerated tone of aggressive defence in the Prussian Landtag, the furious onslaught of his harangues, were intended to silence the tongues at Court which denounced him as a demagogue and a Radical. Paradoxical as it may sound, one may safely assert that nothing more effectually helped King William in his later foreign policy than the opinion pervading all Europe in 1864 and 1866 that, having lost all hold upon the minds of his people, weakened and crippled in every sense of the word by Bismarckian folly, his Majesty could never strike a blow.

There was peace and concord in Germany between 1866 and 1877. Without becoming a Liberal, and whilst opposing every attempt to outstep certain limits, Bismarck created and rather enjoyed an alliance with the majority formed in his favour by the National Liberals and a moderate section of the Conservatives. The German Empire, proclaimed by the German sovereigns at Versailles and established upon somewhat novel principles of federation by a Parliamentary statute, looked to outsiders as a home for progress and liberty. There were dangers lurking, it is true, beneath many a provision of the new constitution, such as the absence of an upper house, and the substitution in its stead of delegates from the separate Governments, acting in each case according to instructions received, authorised to speak whenever they choose before the Reichstag, but deliberating separately and secretly both upon bills to propose and upon replies to give to resolutions of the Reichstag. In fact this *Bundesrath*, or Federal Council, represents the governing element under the Emperor, with functions both administrative and legislative. By an artificial method of counting, Prussia, although she would command three-fifths of all the voters by virtue of her population, has less than one-third. Thus the possibility of an imbroglio between the Governments is ever present, as well as that of a hasty vote in the popular assembly.

It will never, probably, be quite understood why Prince Bismarck broke loose from a political alliance which, it would seem, had given no trouble whatever. In foreign affairs the House in its immense majority abstained from even the faintest attempt at interference. As for patronage, it has been said that no appointment was ever solicited for anyone by a member of the Liberal party. From ministerial down to menial posts no claim was raised, no request preferred. If the section of moderate Conservatives above mentioned has furnished a few ambassadors like Prince Hohenlohe, Count Munster, Baron Keudell, and Count Stolberg, that was by the chief's free will. Why, then, it has been asked, a change so absolute as the one the world has witnessed, from the saying of the Chancellor in 1877 that his ideal was to have high financial duties on half-a-dozen objects and Free Trade on all others, to one of the most comprehensive tariffs in the world two years later? His own and his friends' explanations are lamentably deficient—"growing anaemia and impoverishment of the

country," "drowning of native industry by foreign manufacturers," "corn imported cheaper than produced," and what not. The present writer, looking from afar, has always thought two motives to have been paramount in the Chancellor's mind when he separated from the Liberals and became, not a convinced, but a thorough-going Protectionist. It is not said that these were his only motives. Chess-players know that each important move affects not only the figures primarily attacked, but changes the whole texture of the play.

First, then, and foremost, fresh sources of income were wanted to make the finances of the Empire independent from the several exchequers of the states bound by statute to make up for any deficiency *pro rata parte* of their population. Two or three objects would have provided the needful, viz. spirits and beetroot sugar and (with due caution) tobacco. Or an "Imperial" income-tax, changing according to each year's necessities. Or both systems combined. Tobacco, it is true, was tried, and the attempt failed. Spirits would bear almost any taxation, but the Chancellor does not choose to tread upon the tender toe of the great owners of land who are potato-growers, and consequently distillers on a large scale. And another important class of agriculturists, the beetroot-growers and sugar-producers, were not to be trifled with either. But how about direct taxation, the manly sacrifice of free peoples, the plummet by which to sound the enlightenment of a nation? The Chancellor instinctively felt, I believe, that there he would be going beyond his depth; that under such a *régime* the free will of citizens must have the fullest swing; that "prerogative" would suffer, if not immediately, yet as a necessary sequence. And so he deliberately abandoned Free Trade and espoused indirect taxation and Protection.

Success, let Free Traders say what they please on the subject, success has accompanied Bismarck's genius on this novel field, as well as on the older fields where all mankind acknowledges his superiority. For the coffers of the Empire are filling. A vast majority in the Reichstag not only accepts, but improves upon, his Protectionist demands. He has become the demigod of the bloated manufacturing, mining, and landlord interests throughout the country. He is now about to win the last of the great industries, and the one which withstood his blandishments the longest, viz. the trans-oceanic carrying trade. He is credited with having improved the state of certain trades, even by such as know perfectly well that, like the former depression, the present improvement in those has been universal. The whole country is becoming Protectionist. All young men, even in Hamburg and Bremen, believe in Protection as "the thing." The Prussian landlord, whose soul was steeped in Free Trade so long as Prussia was a grain-exporting country, cherishes Protectionist convictions now that she must largely import cereals. The bureaucrat who had never sworn by other economic lawgivers than

Adam Smith and his followers, now accepts Professor Adolphus Wagner's ever-changing sophisms. And as for the south and the west of Germany, why they adore the man who has fulfilled that dream of Protection in which they, as disciples of Friedrich List, had grown up. It is true that all large cities even there are protesting against the lately imposed and quite lately increased duties upon cereals; but then, "Can any good thing come out of" large cities? Compared to the difficulties that impede the action of the Free Trade party in Germany, Mr. Bright's and Mr. Cobden's up-hill work sinks into insignificance.

An even graver aspect is presented by the Vatican question, graver in the same proportion as religious, or at least Church differences, have a stronger hold upon the German mind even nowadays than purely political or economic ones. There can be no doubt that the week or more which Archbishop Ledochowski spent at headquarters in Versailles in the winter of 1870 to 1871 forms a turning-point in modern history. When may we hope to learn the details of those secret interviews? That he implored and threatened alternately is certain, and there can be no doubt as to the alliance he was authorised to offer or the price at which it was to be obtained. Rome and Latium, or war to the knife! Not many weeks afterwards Bismarck returned to Germany, and was not a little surprised to find an army in battle-array in his own country, called out by the war-whoop of a clergy the great majority of which, with nearly all the bishops as their born leaders, had opposed the Vatican decrees only eight or nine short months before. Not that warnings had been wanting previously. For had not Prince Hohenlohe, the eminent statesman who is now filling the post of ambassador at Paris, then Prime Minister in Bavaria, invited the Governments most interested in the result of the coming Vatican Council to come to an understanding beforehand as to the treatment its decrees should receive at their hands? Bismarck did not then see his way about interfering, although we read in one of his despatches of 1869 that "far-going changes in the organism of the Church of Rome, as designed by the absolutist tendencies of the Curial party, would not remain without influence upon the relations of that Church to the State." Prince Hohenlohe's attempt failed, but its tendency remained impressed upon Bavaria's action ever since, and it is a significant fact that the final impulse to what has since, to no purpose, alas! been called the *Kulturkampf*, or "battle for (higher) culture," in 1873, had not Bismarck for its author but the Government of Bavaria. Then followed three years of unremitting warfare, in order to circumscribe once for all the permissible freedom of the Vaticanist Church. *Per iaturo bellum geritum*, was at that time a favourite expression of the Chancellor's. A whole code of bills was gradually presented, partly to the Prussian Chambers and partly to the Reichstag, all tending to

crisis, as in the case of Free Trade, the difficulty for Germany is far more serious than it ever was in England? If the statistics of the British Isles showed the same proportion of Roman Catholics to the rest of the population, the temple of Janus could not have been so permanently closed. There would then be, for England as for Germany, a succession of armistices only, instead of peace in perpetuity.

Nothing, to a beginner in the study of Bismarck's character, would appear so utterly puzzling as his demeanour towards the Communists, Socialists, or, as they call themselves in Germany, Social Democrats. One of his most trusted secretaries is an old ally and correspondent of Herr Karl Marx, the high-priest of Communism, who, towards the end of his London career, rode the whirlwind and directed the storm of German Socialism. Bismarck himself confesses to having received in private audience Lassalle, one certainly of the most capable men of modern Germany, and to whom as to its first author a retrospective inquiry would trace back the present formidable closely-ruled organisation of Socialist operatives of Germany. The first minister of the Prussian Crown was closeted once—people say more than once, but that does not matter—with the ablest subverter of the modern fabric of society. He found him "mighty pleasant to talk to." He liked his predilection for a powerful supreme authority overawing the organised masses, though "whether he did so in the interest of a dynasty of Lassalles or of Hohenzollerns" seemed to Herr von Bismarck an open question. After Lassalle's tragical death in 1864, we observe how the Prussian Government, while watching with Argus-eyes every excess of speech among Liberals, allowed his first successors, Schweizer and others, a vulgar set of demagogues, such licence of bloody harangue as has of late years got Louise Michel into trouble in republican France. Then we hear of nothing as between Bismarck and the Socialists for some years, the years I have described above as years of peace and concord in Germany, till suddenly, on the occasion of two attempts made in 1878, by Hödel and by Nobiling, against the Emperor's life, he came down upon that sect as with a sledge-hammer. His famous Anti-Socialist Bill was at first rejected. It passed into law only after a dissolution, the electors having in their affectionate pity for the wounded Emperor unequivocally given their verdict in favor of suppression. It has since been re-accepted three times by an unwilling House and with diminishing majorities through Bismarck's personal exertions, the exertions of the same man who had fostered and protected the beginnings of Socialism, and who had the watchword given out at the last general elections of 1884, that "His Serene Highness the Chancellor would prefer the sight of ten Social-Democrats to that of one Liberal (*Deutsch-Freianiger*)."

Now what is the clue to this Comedy of Errors? No mere waywardness or perversity of character, but some powerful bias and a first-cousinship in principle must account for one of the strangest

anomalies in modern history. Perhaps the following consideration will render both the "bias" and the "first-cousinship" at least intelligible. Prince Bismarck is a good hater. Now if he has any one antipathy stronger than another, and that through life, it is that against the burgher class, the reverse of aristocrats, the born Liberals, townsmen mostly yet not exclusively—the "bourgeois," as the French call them (although, if I err not, the exact counterpart to the "bourgeois" species is not found on German soil), a law-abiding set, independent of Government, paying their taxes, and thoroughly happy. When they, through their representatives, bade him defiance in 1862 to '65 and thwarted his measures of coercion, his inmost soul cried, *Acheronta movebo!* He sent for Lassalle, he paid his successors' debts, and generally assisted the sect. So much for the "bias." And now for the "first-cousinship." No student of history will deny that despotism, whenever it has arisen, or been preserved, in highly civilised communities, will extend more of a fatherly care to the masses than Liberalism. This cannot be otherwise; for Liberalism sets itself to educate the masses to self-responsibility, and each individual to thrift and self-reliance. The sight of an able-bodied beggar is, to a genuine Liberal, a source of anger first and only on further contemplation of pity. He will exert all his energies to remove every obstacle from out of the way of his poorer brethren; he will preach wise economy, and facilitate it by personal sacrifices and legislative inducements; but he will not tempt the Government of his country to act as a second Providence for the operative classes. Quite the reverse is Bismarck's opinion. According to him the State should exercise "practical Christianity." With Titanic resolution to drive out Satan through Beelzebub, he does not shrink from acknowledging and proclaiming the "right of labour." There is probably nothing left to say after your Mps have spoken these unholy, blood-stained words. If there was, he would be the man to say it rather than allow himself to be outbid by mob-leaders of the Socialistic feather. *Droit au travail*, forsooth! The phrase has cost thousands their lives in the Parisian carnage of June, 1848. In the mouth of Karl Marx and other outspoken champions of his cause it means absorption by the State of all the *sources* of labour, such as land and factories, because by such absorption only can the State insure work for the unemployed. In the mouth of Bismarck it means a lesser thing, of course, in extent but not in its essence. As Chief Minister of Prussia he has ably brought about the purchase of nearly all lines of railway within that monarchy. As Chancellor of the Empire he has tried his very best to obtain a monopoly on tobacco. All Accident Insurance Companies have already been ruined and their place taken, so far as accidents to factory-hands, &c., are concerned, by an Imperial Office. His mighty hand is stretched out already to suppress and absorb all other Insurances. The kingdom of the Incas in ancient Peru, as described in Prescott's volumes, has probably not done more

work for its subjects than Bismarck's ideal of a German Empire would do for its inhabitants. With every species of occupation or enterprise managed directly by Government, why should the ruler of an Empire, or of a Socialist Republic, hesitate about proclaiming a right to labour? A critic might object that its proclamation by Bismarck in 1884 was premature, inasmuch as he had failed in carrying his Monopoly Bill, and could not be certain of success regarding other State encroachments. Granted. But a "first-cousinship" between his views on social reform and those of Messrs. Bebel and Liebknecht is an actuality of modern Germany and should be seen to by those who desire this central power of Europe to remain exempt from a social revolution.

Cursory as this review of Bismarck's past life and present policy has of necessity been, some indulgent reader may perhaps bestow upon me—besides his thanks for having withstood the temptation to quote the pithy and at times impassioned utterances of the wittiest man in power of the present day—just enough of his confidence to believe that I have suppressed no trait of importance.

However, since there is one thing more important still than a great man, namely his country, let us not dismiss the interesting subject of this retrospect without inquiring what that country has gained and what lost through his agency. Germany possesses a federation, not constructed after any existing pattern, not made to please any theory, not the object of anybody's very passionate admiration, but accepted in order to alter as little as possible the accustomed territorial and political arrangements. In one sense it has no army, for the Prussian and the Bavarian armies, although the Empire bears the cost, still exist. In one sense it possesses not the indirect taxation, for the individual States do the collecting of custom-house duties, &c. In one sense it has scarcely any organs of administration, for the whole internal Government, the schools, courts of law, and police, all belong to the single States; and foreign affairs, the navy, the post-office, and railways in Alsace, are the only fields of Imperial direct administration. Yet what it has is valuable enough. The Empire rules the army, and can legislate over and control a prodigious amount of national subjects. Its foreign policy is one. The military command is one. Certain specified sources of revenue are the Empire's. Patriotic aspirations are fulfilled. The individual sovereigns in Germany possess a guarantee of their status, the operative classes an opportunity for organisation and improvement on a large scale. Monarchical feeling has gained in depth, both generally and with personal reference to the Emperor and to the Crown Prince, both "representative men" in the best sense of the word, and the Crown Prince the most lovable man of his day.

Another salutary constitutional reform—not of Bismarck's making, for he gave his consent unwillingly, and not without first having marred its beauty, but yet an effect of his great deeds—is the

Prussian "Kreis-" and "Provinzial-Ordnung," first introduced in 1874. No more logical deduction was possible than this commencement of decentralisation within the Prussian monarchy. Before that date provincial Diets had existed for fifty years, and a kind of assembly had also managed certain affairs for the Kreis, an administrative unit smaller than an English county, and averaging about 100,000 inhabitants. In the same proportion as German unity made progress, it was believed that self-government ought to become more extensively introduced, and the "tendency of the blood towards the head," or capital, be obviated. The example of home-rule presented by the "Kreis" and the provinces of Prussia since this reform is not assuredly of a nature to frighten weak nerves. But much money is now usefully spent within and by the provinces independently of any decree from a central authority; and as regards willingness to work on provincial and (so to say) county boards, it is said to be beyond all praise. An English public man of high standing assured me, some years ago, that these Prussian beginnings of home-rule had attracted the serious notice of Mr. Gladstone. I do not wonder at it.

Another permanent good for which Germany seems indebted to Bismarck, and the last I will mention, is of quite modern date—I mean his colonial policy. Individual Germans have at all times and in immense numbers found their way across the sea. On the Baltic and North Sea coast, German ports, though few in number, yet command a very large trade. Next to the English, German traders form the most numerous community in every place, however remote, where business of any kind can be transacted. But to convert the inland Philistines—that vast majority of Germans who have never sniffed sea-air—into enthusiasts for a colonial empire required all Bismarck's ability and prestige. No doubt he desisted in the movement a chance for a diversion of the public mind from obnoxious topics. It was useful to him to produce an impression as if the export trade, stagnating as it must under the baneful effects of modern Protection, could rally under the influence of colonial enterprise. These considerations would not, however, suffice to explain his long-considered, cautious proceedings in this matter. To comprehend his motives fully, it will be necessary to admit that his prescient mind would consider the time, apparently not very distant, when what are now styled Great Powers will be dwindling fast by the side of such gigantic empires as seem intent upon dividing the earth's surface between them, like England with her colonial possessions, and Russia. The effect upon this country, its foreign policy, and the very character of its inhabitants, would be alike cramping unless a way for expansion was opened for each. When the political schemes of a considerable man are subjects of speculation, it is wiser to guess at something exalted if you wish to come near the truth. So probably in this case. No doubt he, too, has foreseen the reaction which, at no very remote period of German history, will gain a mastery over people's minds,

when failures and disappointments begin to crowd around each of the present equatorial enterprises. But he believes in his countrymen's capacity to overcome failure and disappointment without recourse to costly warlike expeditions, for which Germany is unfitted by her institution of universal and short military service.

Where brightness and splendour are, there will one find Erebus too. The Bismarckian era has not escaped this curse. To put it all into one phrase, extinction of individual character has followed the Chancellor like his shadow. He has no disciples, cares not to have any. Friends he possesses among the comrades of his early years, and he is a faithful and jovial companion with them. But all around him, in Prussia, in the Imperial Government, in the Bundesrath, nothing is visible save destruction—the field covered with bodies of the slain. The demeanour of the younger Pitt, hitherto believed to have been the most tyrannical of ministers, was mildness itself in comparison with Bismarck's. In Downing Street of old, Chancellors of the Exchequer and Secretaries of State were requested to sign despatches they had never read, with the Premier's hand covering the page. This was bad enough in sober truth, but Bismarck's practice is worse. A minister elaborates and perfects a Bill on the lines repeatedly concerted with his chief, obtains the royal assent, and defends the measure before Parliament. Suddenly the whole fabric is overthrown by Bismarck's using, as the case may be, his tongue or his pen as the instrument of destruction, but quite as often in public as in private. It used to be said of the German civil service that it consisted of men with a crooked back and an erect conscience. That time is past; the generation of placemen of all grades which has grown up since the war of 1866 knows of one idol only, success; and of one ambition only, to attract the attention and to retain the favour of the great man. Parliament is demoralised in many of its members because he accepts no divided allegiance. An M.P. may be drawn into his following on account of duties on timber, or on slate, yet he may desire to keep some little private corner for economic or political convictions on other topics. In vain; his soul is demanded of him. Finally, the important, the influential, the rich of all classes are drawn into the vortex of his will. The habit of initiative, without which Englishmen could not live and in which Germany had certainly made some progress, is fast disappearing before an omnipresent State power. The millennium of every Socialist dream, viz. a condition where all work is fixed, ordered, and requited by Government, has more than dawned upon Germany. Bismarck has made Germany great and Germans small.

One consoling word, however, may conclude these remarks. Democracy in Germany—it may be presumptuous in a foreigner to place the result of his observations in opposition to that of others—has always appeared to me as of a higher stamp than that of any other nation. To define its instincts with fairness, democracy signifies

equality in duty. Who of us that has travelled in non-Prussian parts of the Fatherland since 1867 was not surprised to find that one innovation only was popular there with the commonest people, and that one just what would make every Englishman frantic with rage—what a writer of note calls the “thrice-accursed system of universal military service !” And why is it popular with the South German labourer and peasant ? Because, in the words of a sentry at Constance, whose *patois* I had great difficulty in understanding, “because the Baron is doing just the same duty round the corner there,” pointing in the direction of some other public building. Or, again, why do we find more cheerfulness in the labouring man of that country, unless it be that he has a chance of purchasing with his money, after years of labour and of economy, some house and patch of land upon which he has set his eyes ; and more cheerfulness again in the Rhenish labourer than in a Pomeranian, because patches of land are more in the market on the Rhine than in the East ? He does not complain that another man has risen to be an owner of land quicker than himself, provided that light and shade have been fairly allotted, provided that the duty of work and thrift has been equally shared.

As long as democracy in Germany signifies work, and equally for all, so long are the prophets of social catastrophes likely to be disappointed. It is quite a mistake to say the well-drilled army prevents a social catastrophe. Not so. The peasant lad who spends from two and a half to four years of his life in a regiment would be an easy prey to the Nihilist propaganda, and not to be trusted with his rifle if he did not bring an hereditary treasure of rough, unspoken satisfaction to the door of his barracks.

I know perfectly that I am asserting all this in the teeth of an astounding fact, viz. that two-and-twenty Socialist members have found their way, under the wings of universal suffrage, into the Reichstag. Of their tenets, wherever honestly expressed, it is impossible to speak with sufficient detestation. Reticence is their present watchword ; their pandemonium of atheism and lust and greed is studiously left in the background, and the legislative programme with which they appear before the footlights sounds almost like sense. Met half-way, and even more than half-way, by a rash and mighty Chancellor, they will obtain a certain amount of parliamentary success. It is not absolutely impossible that even that monstrous absurdity, their ten hours’ “normal” day of adult male labour, be carried in the Reichstag ; but beyond that there is as yet no fear. No greater contrast can be imagined than between the honest, ingrained, and deep-rooted Democratic spirit of the German people which is content in an equality of duty, and that foul importation from French sources, long dried up even in France, which styles itself Social Democracy, and means nothing in truth but *ôte-toi que ja n’y mette*.

* PRINCE OUTISKY.

GIVE AND TAKE WITH THE COLONIES.

UNION OF THE EMPIRE BY TARIFF.

THE suggestion I am about to make is one which is at once outside the limits laid down as well by those who seek to foster native industry in the face of foreign competition by imposing high customs duties in the name of Protection ; by those who propose to force a reduction of, or to provide a compensation for, foreign tariffs under the name of Fair Trade ; and by those who maintain that all customs duties are in themselves bad and ought to be abolished in the name of Free Trade. It is an economical suggestion made primarily with a political object. It will probably be received with favour neither by Protectionists, who will hold that it does not suffice for the protection of native industry ; by Fair Traders, who will hold that it fails in redressing the injuries inflicted, by foreign tariffs ; nor by Free Traders, who will hold it to be an infraction of their principles, and the thin end of a Protectionist wedge. These last will also probably accuse it of economical heresy, in that it seeks to bring in trade to the help of politics, and to treat economical matters from a political point of view. As to this I would say something in advance.

The modern school of political economists are remarkable for the determination they show to separate economical from political questions. They claim to treat economical questions independently of political considerations. They deal with the separate class-interests of the consumer or the producer, and assume to treat them as matters which should be regarded without reference to the common national interests. When they are economists they cease to be politicians ; when they are politicians they cease to be economists. They claim to treat the national gains apart from the national destinies, and are quite ready to disregard a political loss if only they can compass a material profit. There are not a few, indeed, of them who treat of public matters as though material or economic results were those on which alone the attention of public men should be fixed, and as though all the rest would take care of itself. "Man *shall* live by bread alone," they contend, and when the statesman has provided the bread the rest will follow. They claim, therefore, that the science of economics is superior to that of politics ; but, above all, they claim that it is separate therefrom, and is entitled to separate and independent treatment. This claim has been all too lightly allowed, and it is all too commonly admitted that economical questions of a public nature may be, should be, and must be, treated on solely economical grounds, and political questions on solely political grounds. True prudence, however, and true statesmanship must recognise what experience teaches—that in practice there is no economical question

of a public nature that does not affect politics, nor any political question which does not react on economics; and if we would estimate the effect of public acts we must recognise this truth. Those who would formulate an economical system for the country must regard its political effects, those who would lay down a policy must bear in mind its economical results.

There is this further peculiarity about the modern political economists, that while they are perfectly ready to make an economical sacrifice for a political object out of the taxes in general, they resist as a monstrosity and resent as a blasphemy any idea of making such a sacrifice out of one kind of tax in particular, and especially out of taxes levied by way of customs duties. When you have taken from the industry of the country in taxation an aggregate sum of some ninety millions, they will readily allow that you may sacrifice a handful of millions thereof to the political object of re-establishing the Queen's sovereignty in the Transvaal, or to the political object of depriving Turkey of a portion of her dominions marching with the Greek frontier, or to the political object of asserting British influence in Egypt. But if one should propose to gain a much more indisputably great political advantage by shifting some of the customs duties now levied on tea to corn, or some of those now levied on tobacco to cotton, they would cry out that this must be resisted *because* it is an economical sacrifice, and would refuse to allow any possible political gain to be weighed in the balance against the interference with the consumer.

Matters of trade and matters of tariff are, in short, declared to be purely economical, and their political aspects are declined. Politics is held to have no proper connection with them, and each kind of subject is claimed to be kept in a sacred separation from the other.

Among the matters which are claimed as being political, and as being therefore only capable of political treatment, without reference being allowed to their economical aspect, is the question of the colonies. That they should, if possible, be somehow welded together with the rest of the Queen's empire is now on all hands admitted, and on all hands the means are being sought by which such a welding may be effected. But the matter is treated as being wholly political. The suggestions made are of federation, of colonial representation in the British Parliament, of colonial Boards of Advice, colonial Committees of the Privy Council, and so forth. It does not seem to have occurred to any of the great authorities who have made suggestions to this effect that this is a question of economics as well as of politics. Yet so it is. Nay, it is a question far more economical than political. The colonists are shrewd men of business, as we know; no system that joins them to the empire will satisfy them, however good it may be politically, unless it is also good economically. They must be able to see a material advantage in it as well as a political gain; and it

may confidently be predicted that if ever the splendid result is achieved of binding together into one whole the British race that has spread out over the world, it will only be achieved by making the union a source of common material advantage to the colonists and to the mother country.

A consideration of the material conditions of the colonies and of the mother country suggests a means by which this result may be reached, without adopting any of the purely political suggestions that have been made, without doing any violence to the constitution, or confronting any of the risks that must attend the discussion of respective rights which any attempt at their co-ordination must provoke. It can be done by the British Parliament alone; it can be done so simply that, by using purely economical methods, the greatest, and most beneficial, and most far-reaching political results may be attained.

The mere magnitude of the countries which own the name at this moment of British colonies or British possessions, and the marvellous increase they are making in population and in prosperity, should alone suffice to secure for them a principal part of the attention of every English statesman; for it is as certain as anything can be that, in a relatively short time, the greater as well as the better part of the British race will be that which has carried the English tongue, English laws, and English manners and customs beyond the seas; and that the British Isles themselves will be but as it were the advanced post towards Europe of the great race. If, therefore, this advanced post is not to be cut off from and disconnected with the main body, it behoves us to consider whether there are not means to be found by which the whole may be bound together by the strongest and most abiding of all ties—the ties of common interests.

Grouping these colonies and possessions according to their character we find¹:—

	Area in Square Miles.	Population.
I. British settlements in Australasia	3,103,665	2,936,409
British North America	3,510,592	4,504,319
British colonies in South Africa . .	218,700	1,652,511
British West Indies	12,971	1,213,144
	<hr/> 6,845,928	<hr/> 10,306,383
II. Other colonies and possessions, such as Mauritius, Hong Kong, the Straits Settlements, and West African settlements. }	106,818	2,113,612
III. British India	904,135	196,790,853
Ceylon	24,702	2,763,984
	<hr/> 928,837	<hr/> 201,554,837
Grand Total	<hr/> 7,881,683	<hr/> 218,974,632

(1) *Statistical Abstract of Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom, 1884.*

We have in group I.—of the great colonies proper—an area of some 7,000,000 of square miles, with a population, speaking roughly, of 10,000,000; in group II.—of other colonies and possessions—an area of 100,000 square miles, with a population of 2,000,000; in group III.—of India and Ceylon—an area of 900,000 square miles, with a population of 201,000,000; in all an area of nearly 8,000,000 of square miles, with a population of nearly 214,000,000. Compare this with the British Isles, having an area of no more than 121,000 square miles, with a population of 35,951,865, and it will be concluded, probably, that the question of the near future will be, not how to prevent the colonies from slipping away from the United Kingdom, but rather how to prevent the United Kingdom from slipping away from the colonies.

Now of all these colonies it will be allowed that what they want is (1) a market for their products of food and the other raw materials of manufacture; and (2) a supply of manufactures for their population; while, in addition, the first group of great colonies requires (3) a supply of labour.

Of the United Kingdom it will equally be allowed that what it wants is (1) a supply of food and of other raw materials of manufacture; (2) a market for its manufactures; (3) an outlet for its surplus population.

Here, then, we see that the United Kingdom and the colonies are so situated as to be each fitted to supply the wants of the other; and as a matter of fact each does now to some extent, yet not at all to the extent of its ability and capacity, supply the wants of the other.

In 1883 the trade with the colonies and British possessions was represented by the following figures¹:—

	Imported therefrom.	Exported thereunto.
I. Australia	£25,936,201	£26,839,490
Canada and Newfoundland	12,283,727	10,109,506
The Cape and Natal	5,895,909	5,000,251
The West Indies and Guinea	4,887,588	3,752,545
	<u>£49,003,425</u>	<u>£45,701,892</u>
II. Other colonies and possessions:		
Channel Islands	£806,423	£764,394
Gibraltar	39,211	800,779
Malta	151,578	1,159,264
British Honduras	294,006	141,836
The Straits Settlements	4,643,016	2,793,106
Hong Kong	1,171,986	3,047,470
Mauritius	414,963	580,558
West African settlements	241,509	415,801
The Gold Coast	488,106	510,213
Other possessions	416,727	343,768
	<u>£8,622,615</u>	<u>£10,557,174</u>

(1) *Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom, 1869 to 1883, p. 39.*

	Imported therefrom.	Exported therefrom.
III. British India	£38,882,829	£33,382,786
Ceylon	2,172,786	759,079
	<u>£41,055,665</u>	<u>£34,141,865</u>
Total British colonies and possessions.	98,681,503	90,400,921
Foreign countries	328,210,074	215,036,149
Total trade of the United Kingdom .	<u>£426,891,579</u>	<u>£305,437,070</u>

These figures are well worth consideration. They show—

I. That the three groups of British colonies and possessions supply us with nearly one-fourth in value of all the imports that we require.

II. That they take from us 42 per cent., or nearer one-half than one-third, of all the exports we send away.

III. That the majority of this trade is done with what I have called group I. of our great colonies, with a population of 10,000,000; that the next greatest trade is done with India, with a population of 201,000,000; and that the least of all is done with the small colonies and possessions, with a population of 2,000,000.

But there are other sets of facts which are also to be borne in mind.

IV. It will be found that, while of our whole exports to foreign countries (£215,036,149), only £156,321,921, or 72·7 per cent., consists of British and Irish produce; of our exports to British colonies and possessions (£90,400,921) no less than £83,477,552, or as much as 92·3 per cent., consists of British and Irish produce.¹

V. That during the last ten years our whole exports to foreign countries have *decreased* from £239,857,058 in 1873 to £215,036,149 in 1883—a decrease of £24,820,909.²

VI. That during this time our exports of British and Irish produce to foreign countries have decreased from £188,836,132 to £156,321,921—a decrease of £32,514,211.³

VII. That during the same time our whole exports to British colonies and possessions have *increased* from £71,147,707 in 1873 to £90,400,921 in 1883—an increase of £19,253,214.⁴

VIII. That during this time our exports of British and Irish produce to British colonies and possessions have *increased* from £66,828,471 in 1873 to £83,477,552 in 1883—an increase of £17,149,081.⁵

Thus we find that the British colonies and possessions are taking both absolutely and relatively more of all our exports, and especially more of our exports of domestic produce, while foreign countries are taking both absolutely and relatively less, and especially less of our exports of domestic produce.

In the face of these facts it does not require us to consider long in

(1) *Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom*, pp. 39 and 69.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 39.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 39.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 69.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 69.

order to come to a conclusion as to where the best markets are to be looked for in the future for our manufactures. Those markets are clearly to be found in the British colonies and possessions; and it follows, then, that everything that can tend to develop the population and the prosperity of the colonies will tend also to enlarge the markets for our manufactures. It also follows that, merely as a matter of trade, and to go no farther for the present, our policy should be to foster and develop the increasing trade with the colonies and comparatively to neglect the decreasing trade with the foreigner.

Let us now look at the other side of the matter—at the question of the supply to ourselves of the food and raw material we need. It will be found that the six principal articles of import into the United Kingdom are the following, which in 1883 were imported to the values stated¹ :—

		Value.
Corn	150,763,140 cwts.	£67,622,367
Cotton (raw)	15,485,121 cwts.	45,042,296
Wool	495,946,779 lbs.	24,953,132
Sugar (raw)	20,366,627 cwts.	20,473,237
Wood	6,609,942 loads	17,161,545
Tea	222,262,431 lbs.	11,542,931
Total		<u>£186,795,508</u>

These are the principal things we require from abroad, and their aggregate value amounts to nearly one-half of that of all our imports.

Now of all these six essential articles of import, there is not a single one that is not produced by some one or other of the British colonies and possessions. More than that, there is also not one of the six which is not at present sent to us by some British colony or possession. Let us take them in order.

Corn. Of our total imports of corn in 1883, we received from British colonies or possessions as under² :—

	Cwts.
Australasia	2,790,152
British North America	5,228,066
British India	11,248,988
Total	<u>19,267,206</u>

out of a total import of 150,763,140 cwts.; or 12·1 per cent. of the whole.

Cotton. Of our total imports of cotton in 1883 we received from British colonies or possessions as under³ :—

	Lbs.
British West Indies and Guiana	462,784
British possessions in the East Indies	260,698,480
Total	<u>261,161,264</u>

(1) *Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom*, pp. 41, 45, 47, 58, and 61.

(2) *Ibid.*, pp. 60, 61, 62, and 63.

(3) *Ibid.*, pp. 64 and 65.

out of a total import of 1,734,333,552 lbs. ; or 15·0 per cent. of the whole.

Wool. Of our total imports of wool in 1883 we received from British colonies and possessions as under¹ :—

	Lbs.
British possessions in the East Indies	24,822,130*
British possessions in South Africa	48,870,081
Australasia	351,685,806
Total	425,378,717

out of a total import of 495,946,779 lbs. ; or 85·7 per cent. of the whole.

Sugar. Of our total imports of sugar in 1883 we received from British colonies or possessions as under² :—

	Cwts.
British West Indies	1,656,217
India	1,419,769
Mauritius	289,195
Natal	17,576
	<u>3,382,757</u>

out of a total import of 20,366,627 cwts. ; or 16·6 per cent. of the whole.

Wood. Of our total imports of wood in 1883 we received from British colonies or possessions as under³ :—

British North America	1,534,565 loads.
---------------------------------	------------------

out of a total import of 6,609,942 loads; or 23·2 per cent. of the whole.

Tea. Of our total imports of tea in 1883 we received from British colonies or possessions as under⁴ :—

British India	59,252,436 lbs.
-------------------------	-----------------

out of a total import of 222,262,431 lbs. ; or 22·1 per cent. of the whole.

It is to be remembered that the British colonies and possessions have absolutely no advantage at our ports as compared with foreign countries, and that their ability to send us, in competition with foreign countries, so large a relative supply of these six essential articles of import, arises wholly from their natural advantages in soil and climate, and in the energy and working power of their population.

We have now, as it would seem, completed the circle of trade upon ground made good at each step by official figures. • We have seen that the British colonies and possessions take our manufactures yearly in larger quantities, while foreign countries take them in smaller quantities; and we have also seen that these same colonies and possessions, with their infinite variety of soil and climate, do not only produce the six great articles of food and raw material which are essential to us, but that they produce them under conditions which enable them, without any favour whatever, to compete with foreign countries in supplying us with them.

(1) *Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom*, pp. 64 and 65.

(2) *Parliamentary Paper C. 4095*, 1884.

(3) *Ibid.*

(4) *Ibid.*

What now remains, whether from an economical or a political point of view? What but to take such measures, if any there be to be found, as will encourage our trade to keep within the circle already traced out, such as will suffice to contain the circle there where it is weak and as it were bulging out, and will help to confirm it there where it is strong.

Such means are to be found in the redistribution of our customs tariff.

As has been shown, our colonies and possessions already compete, in our supply of food and raw material, with foreign countries, and that without the slightest advantage. Give them now, by a redistribution of the British customs tariff, some slight advantage, and it will be merely a question of time before they will drive the foreigner out of the market and become our only and our sufficient source of supply. The fact that they compete now suffices to show that a very slight advantage would, in operations so vast, give them an irresistible preponderance, and would enable them to replace the foreigner altogether.

There is levied at this moment at our ports in the shape of customs duties, a sum of nearly twenty millions sterling, whereof tobacco, charged at the rate of 310·8 per cent., contributes nearly nine millions; tea, charged at the rate of 36·6 per cent., over four millions and a quarter; spirits, charged at the rate of 222·2 per cent., nearly four millions and a quarter; wine, charged at the rate of 23·7 per cent., over one million and a quarter; coffee, charged at the rate of 4·1 per cent., less than a quarter of a million; and other articles less than three quarters of a million.

My suggestion is, not that these twenty millions should be increased, but that they should be redistributed so that only the same aggregate charge should be levied in this way on the trade of the country, but that it should be levied upon other articles than those few which now alone bear it. In short, I suggest that in the case of each one of the six great articles of import, a customs duty shall be laid upon the produce of foreign countries, while the produce of the colonies is allowed to enter free. For the purpose in view, as has been said, the slightest rates of duty would suffice, and as the purpose in view does not require or demand an increase of indirect taxation, the sum realised by the proposed new duties might be taken and used in diminution of those now existing.

I would then tax foreign corn, cotton, wool, sugar, wood, and tea with a differential customs duty as against the foreign producer, of some two or three per cent. only. That would suffice.

Take now as an example the matter of corn, as to which my suggestion would no doubt provoke the greatest outcry. I would tax all foreign corn one shilling a quarter, and let in free all corn from the colonies or British possessions. This shilling a quarter is a duty

to which I claim adherence, or at least an absence of opposition, even from the staunchest of free traders. For during three-and-twenty years the staunchest of free traders did adhere to, or at any rate did not oppose, this very duty. The corn laws were abolished in 1846, leaving this very shilling a quarter duty—registration duty, as it was called—still remaining. The Corn Law League dissolved itself on the very ground that its work was done; and from 1846 to 1869, when the shilling was taken off, no free trader felt aggrieved or moved to renew the exertions and the triumphs of the League against so insignificant an impost. Nearly a quarter of a century of silent acquiescence on the part of men by no means inclined to acquiesce in any duty savouring of protection, or otherwise objectionable, must be allowed to prove that this shilling is neither protective nor objectionable. But for my purpose it would suffice; and its revival as a differential duty against foreign corn would suffice to persuade up to Australia, the Canadas, India, and the Cape, the growth of a yearly increasing proportion, and finally the production of the whole of that corn for which we are now so largely dependent upon the United States, Russia, and Germany.

As with corn, so with the rest of the six articles a similar course would be pursued, and to the same, but no greater extent, of a differential duty of from two to three per cent. In the case of tea, on which a duty of 36·6 per cent. (though it is higher than this on the lower qualities) is already levied, a beginning might be made, not by laying on but by taking off duty, by leaving the duty at 6d. per lb. for foreign teas, and reducing it to 5½d. per lb. for Indian teas. On foreign cotton the duty might be 1s. per cwt.; on foreign wool ½d. per lb.; on foreign sugar 6d. per cwt.; and on foreign wood 1s. 6d. per load; these rates being of course mentioned merely to give an idea of the kind of charge proposed, and not as being absolute. And here, be it observed, that the less the duty levied the better I should be pleased; for the end I aim at is that all these six articles should at last come to us from our colonies and possessions alone, that they should come thence free, and that the result should at last be reached of no duty being levied at all upon any one of them.

Our manufacturers, and especially the cotton manufacturers, would, I anticipate, object to this proposal that it would raise the price of their raw material. The reply to any such objection is, first, that the raising of price would only apply to the foreign, not to the colonial-grown raw material; secondly, that it would not be permanent but only temporary, and constantly tending to diminution and finally to disappearance, as the colonies replaced the foreigner; and lastly, that a very slight rise in the price of raw material would be far more than compensated by a very great increase in the demand for manufactures such as must, I apprehend, take place were this plan adopted.

This indeed brings us to a consideration of the effect of such a plan as this upon the colonies themselves. Unlike the settled and inexpansive foreign countries, the British colonies are highly sensitive to any impulse of prosperity, and both ready and able to take advantage of it to the fullest possible extent. The result upon them of a largely increased demand by the United Kingdom for their produce would be that a largely increased area of their millions of acres of untilled land would be brought into cultivation to supply it; that an increased demand for labour would thus arise; that an increased stimulus to population would thereby be created, whereof part would be supplied by emigration—not forced and hopeless, but voluntary and hopeful—of surplus population from the United Kingdom; that the colonies would spring forward into a double activity and prosperity, and that therewith they would develop a double demand for the manufactures of the home country. Here indeed are to be found those new markets for which the British manufacturer has so long and so vainly sighed; here they are to be found without the risk of any conflict with any other European power; here, without conquest, or expedition, or danger of any kind, we may not merely discover but in part create the free-handed consumer of our manufactures whom alone we find in our own colonies.

In the end the result would be this: that the food of the United Kingdom would be wholly supplied to her by her sons across the seas, and no longer depend upon foreign supply with all its risks; that the raw material of British manufacturers would be wholly grown in British colonies by British labour, shipped home in British ships manned by British crews, manufactured at home on British soil by British operatives, re-exported in its manufactured state in British ships manned by British crews, and finally consumed by British customers in British colonies. Then indeed the dependence of Great Britain upon her colonies and of her colonies upon her would be complete, for neither would be materially able to exist without the other. Then also there would be a union between them such as no councils and no federation could effect, yet such as no great wisdom would be required to maintain; for it would be a union founded upon the most lasting basis, that of common interest, and held together by the strongest ties, those of mutual material dependence. And with this would come an equal independence, both for Great Britain and for her colonies, of all foreign nations. Thenceforth, for all that is truly important, we should be able to do without them; and thenceforth the mother country and her children would stand wholly together against the world, an empire complete indeed, because each part would form the complement of the rest; united indeed, because no one part could be touched without touching the rest also.

THOMAS GIBSON BOWLES.

GORDON.

I.—HOW WE LOST GORDON.

MILITARY history cannot be properly written over military telegraph wires. Considerations military, political, and personal alike forbid it. Besides, promptness is of the essence of correspondents' work in the field, and promptness is seldom compatible with completeness. Of this, above all kinds of journalistic effort, may it be truly said that when the work is done we see how unfinished is the workmanship. There are little facts which modify first impressions, but which cannot be learnt until after the news has set the world talking; there are appearances which are deceitful in marches and battles, as in other departments of human effort; and, above all, the correspondent must not tell the whole truth about anything, lest in giving information to his readers at home he affords instruction to enemies in the field, and so brings himself into collision with the military authorities, who are perfectly within their right in insisting upon a strict censorship of telegrams, and would, in Europe or India, be within their right if they insisted on a strict censorship of letters; for there is no knowing how much mischief may lurk in a phrase or a turn of expression undreamt of by the writer, or how the enemy may be burning to know and the staff anxious to conceal something which appears to the correspondent a mere ordinary item of camp news. It may be said, and it can be truly said, that the correspondent who gives such information does not thoroughly know his business; but there is no guarantee whatever at present that a correspondent knows even the elements of his business. And if he knew his business ever so well, he will be liable to sin inadvertently in English camps, so long as he is not taken, at least as much as junior staff-officers are taken, into the confidence of those commanding head-quarters, or the column to which he happens to be attached. General officers commanding the armies of other nations have thought it compatible with their duty to treat correspondents confidentially, and they have not been known to suffer from it. The mischief has been done, where it has arisen, through correspondents being kept in the dark, and the staff trusting to luck that the journalists would not find out what their keen eyes and sharp ears and ready wits have nevertheless discovered, and the immense competition for news has led them to publish. Instances of all these things can be adduced if required, but the point in hand is the justification of the existence of a censorship; and where a censorship exists, whether it be of the mild type affected by Colonel Swaine, or of the more rigorous sort thought necessary by Colonel Grove, the correspondent cannot put before the public the whole facts of the case, or even the whole of the facts which he knows at the time of writing his communication to his employers. When he leaves the

field of operations, however, he recovers his liberty, and so long as he does not play into the hands of the enemy he has a right to correct errors, and supply what has been omitted. Of course, in the vast majority of cases it is not worth while to do so, the public interest in the matter having passed away, and the policy of letting sleeping dogs lie being one dictated alike by prudence and by good-fellowship.

There are, nevertheless, times when silence is a sin against the public confidence reposed in correspondents, and I venture to think that to keep silence about how we lost Gordon is called for by no considerations of private or general policy. It is a sad tale, and one that, told without exaggeration and with as little as may be of the personal element, has many lessons for us in the future. I will pass over the political phase of it, since there are no material facts known to me which are not also known to the world at large. Still it must be placed on record that the plan for the rescue of Gordon was before the Government so long ago as last May, while no action was taken upon it before the middle and end of August. That this delay was a main cause of the deplorable and exasperating failure goes without saying, and I think it is no secret that when the order was given the Government was told the instructions were probably too late. If the task was, notwithstanding, undertaken, we ought to admire the spirit which set itself to overcome difficulties artificially created, rather than to carp at a want of success which was assuredly due to lack neither of energy in the officer commanding in chief nor of sound judgment. For present purposes it is enough to start with the formation of the Staff by which the work was to be directed. This Staff included, naturally, the officers of an Intelligence Department. On no point has Lord Wolseley expressed himself more decidedly than on the necessity of having an Intelligence Department composed of the ablest men. "The utmost care should be taken in the selection" of them, he says in his well-known *Pocket-Book*. Now, there ought to have been no difficulty in this choice in the present instance. We had been for two years in the occupation of Egypt; we had all the strings of its government at the ends of our fingers; we had room and verge enough for knowing the best of the men who had been manipulating the strings; we had even two or three able men at our disposal who had for months been on the border of the destined scene of operations, and the officer commanding made a selection which was at the time deemed satisfactory. Major Kitchener and Colonel Colville were included in the Department because they had shown a mastery of the work required in its preliminary stages; Major Stede was added because he had recommended himself at the head-quarters at Cairo by his assiduity and his aptness. The superintendence of the whole Department was confided to Colonel Sir Charles Wilson, R.E., an officer whose military services had been limited in the extreme, never, I believe, passing beyond those of a lieutenant of Sappers, but

who, having been employed on diplomatic and other similar work in Arabia and Asiatic Turkey, had still been permitted to gain high regimental and army status, so that he had become a lieutenant-colonel of Royal Engineers, nominally posted at Dublin, and a full colonel in the army, by the month of April, 1883. The bearing of these facts will be seen presently.

Sir Charles Wilson as nearly as possible fulfils the conditions prescribed years ago by Lord Wolseley, who said that an officer appointed to such a post as that of Chief of the Intelligence Department should be "of middle age, and have a clear insight into human nature, with a logical turn of mind; nothing sanguine about him, but of a generally calm and distrustful disposition." In addition to these qualifications Sir Charles Wilson has a thorough knowledge of the Arabic tongue, if not of the Nubian or Rotani language, and has a way of worming himself into the confidence of Orientals over a cigarette that in itself would almost have justified his nomination. All went well for three or four months. The General commanding was entirely satisfied with the working of the Department, and I believe still thinks that in the matter of information he was exceedingly well served. He must be a better judge of the facts than the cynics and wits of his force, who bestowed upon this branch of the Quartermaster-General's office the name of The Unintelligent Department. Anyhow, the Department, if it did not lavish money, did not spare it. Means were found for opening and keeping open communications with Gordon in Khartoum quite as often as was useful. No mistake was made as to the dispositions of the various tribes along the Middle Nile. The Department made sure of every step of its way, and was ready for the advance before the troops were. But the delays which had been caused by the overt or actual obstruction of some English and of several Egyptian officials, who had pronounced an opinion hostile to Lord Wolseley's plan, and seemed resolved that events should justify their views, had thrown everything in the way of supplies and of the movements of troops over the date fixed in the plan by as much as a month or six weeks, and the time came when it was necessary to play a bolder game than had been originally contemplated. For the first time in his life Lord Wolseley was impelled to take a "leap in the dark"—to project a force "into the air." Dividing his strength, which was not in itself too great for the purpose originally contemplated, he sent that capital officer, Major-General Earle, to pursue the river route, chastising on his way the murderers of the gallant and accomplished Lieutenant-Colonel Stewart, while he threw across the Bayuda peninsula a small but well-formed column under the command of Brigadier-General Sir Herbert Stewart, whom he described to the writer as "the best soldier he ever knew, at home both with cavalry and infantry." Of Sir Herbert's dash all men knew who knew about military questions;

his prudence was, in the minds of most, more doubtful. Yet it turned out that his dash would have gained, without fighting, an object which was only achieved after two severe struggles. Had he been permitted to take his first column past the Pools of Gakdul and right across the peninsula to the Nile, he would have occupied Metemmah without serious opposition; but discretion forbade this step, and the result is before the world. As second in command General Earle was given Colonel Henry Brackenbury, R.A., one of the foremost soldiers of the time, and an accomplished writer and critic upon military subjects. No one doubted that two such men as Earle and Brackenbury would do all that was required of them, and do it in a thoroughly workmanlike way. General Stewart had no second in command named in General Orders; but Colonel Fred. Burnaby, who had, in his worsted way, volunteered from England for service in any capacity, was, after Stewart's second departure for Gakdul Pools, sent to overtake him, with private instructions to assume the command in case of need. Now Burnaby was a colonel of 1884; Sir Charles Wilson was a colonel, as we have seen, of 1883. In the absence of a promulgation of the appointment of Burnaby to be second in command, his assumption of the post would have seemed to the army and to the world a slight upon Wilson. Lord Wolseley has been very severe, justly severe, upon trusting important commands to those whose chief qualification is seniority. He has denounced the practice as "a blunder if not a crime;" and yet, if any fault is to be found with his arrangements, it is upon this that his critics will first place their fingers. In the result the question whether Burnaby was publicly appointed proved of no practical importance, but the vice of seniority was most flagrantly exemplified. Burnaby was killed in the first fight, in consequence of an order that he gave to the heavy cavalry under, as it would seem, a misapprehension, for he made an effort, unhappily too late, to correct the error.

When Stewart fell, seriously and, as it proved, mortally, wounded in the second fight, the command devolved, as of course, on Colonel Sir Charles Wilson, R.E., who had "never set a squadron in the field, nor the division of a battle knew more than a spinster"—who, in point of fact, could hardly have remembered how to drill a squad—who was possessed of less military knowledge than many volunteer officers at home, and whose training and habits peculiarly unfitted him for any duties of command. Failing him, there came in the roll of seniority a number of lieutenant-colonels of the Foot Guards, the senior of whom had no greater experience of war or the handling of men in combined arms than he could obtain as, at the setting out of the expedition, senior captain and regimental adjutant of the Coldstream Guards. When in due course the command passed from him it fell to a lieutenant-colonel and regimental captain of the Scots Guards. Now not one of these had any knowledge whatever of the mind of

Lord Wolseley upon the duty or business of the column. Sir Charles Wilson, indeed, had instructions bearing upon his functions as political officer, and of these more anon. But he was not many minutes in command, by virtue of his nominal seniority, when it became evident that he would have to rely upon a naval officer and a cavalry officer for anything like a plan of operations. From that time for weeks we were commanded by a committee, and of all the impossible things in the world, the most impossible is probably the conduct of a campaign by a committee. "I would not presume to give you an order," said one officer in nominal command to a subordinate; "you must know as well as I what should be done." "What do you think?" was the query continually on the lips of commanding officer after commanding officer when he met heads of departments. Sir Charles Wilson at the moment command came to him found the brigade had repulsed the enemy but had not beaten off the Soudanese. They were still in force between us and the water for which we were almost, and our camels were quite, dying. To get water within a very few hours or perish was the condition of the situation, and we had been standing on the defensive five hours four miles from water. Something might be said as to the discretion of Sir Herbert Stewart in halting where he did to give battle, he being in column and moving, and the enemy having still to take up formation and to move in a nearly parallel line to keep us from the water. But he was encumbered with a large number of baggage and ammunition and riding camels, and he was unwilling that his men should be asked to fight in a moving square after an exhausting night march of sixteen hours and with empty stomachs. Whether he made a mistake in not advancing at all risks on the Nile and accepting battle on one of the rolling gravel hills nearer the river, and free from the scrub which encompassed our actual position, and which gave shelter to the enemy's marksmen, must remain a matter of controversy. But for Sir Charles Wilson, on succeeding to the command, there were but two courses. One was to take his whole force through an enemy who had had time to choose his positions, and with a cumbrous column this was on the face of it unadvisable. The other was to leave a small force to hold the zereba and to march a fighting and flying column right through the foe to the point required. A soldier would not have hesitated; Sir Charles Wilson hesitated. As it returned from the river the next morning, Sir Charles Wilson sent a message to Lord Charles Beresford, whom he had requested to take charge of the zereba in spite of the Government order aforementioned, saying that he intended to advance at once and take Metemmah, and would be glad of Lord Charles's co-operation. The idea was for the moment given up, so the flying column returned to the zereba, and it was put about that we would march to the river that afternoon "and take Metemmah" the next morning. We marched to the village called El Goubat officially and Abu Kru really. At six the

next morning we advanced against the town. The column marched to the north of Metemmah; after an hour it marched to the south-west of it. Since the famous exploit of the King of France with twenty thousand men, never was there such marching up hills and then marching down again; never was there such an objectless movement of troops in close order under fire. After six hours; after five of them under fire; after establishing, by the efforts of the Royal Engineers and the picked shots of the Rifle Brigade, an admirable little fort within 650 yards of the town, and after being reinforced by the men and some of the guns of Gordon's steamers, which most opportunely arrived, we—retired! Then only did the attempt on Metemmah come to be called a reconnaissance in force. The name was given to it jokingly by myself, but it was seized upon at once as affording a very complete justification of the entertainment of the forenoon. Towards evening I went to Sir Charles Wilson to ask him if he intended to send any messengers to Lord Wolseley, as I desired to get off a dispatch. He informed me that he had handed over the command to Lieutenant-Colonel Boscawen, as he intended to go on to Khartoum with Gordon's steamers. That was on Wednesday, January 21st. Already Lord Charles Beresford had had the two principal steamers examined, and, where needful, repaired by the naval artificers. Before three o'clock that afternoon they could have started for the beleaguered city. But they did not go, though their departure was urged by Khasm-el-Nus, who commanded Gordon's fleet. It was subsequently remarked by a distinguished officer at Korti, on the receipt of Sir Charles Wilson's much-delayed despatches and letters relating to the second and third days' fighting, "The man has lost all his nerve." If I differ from this it is only in wondering whether he had any to lose. His personal pluck is as great as that of most Englishmen, but like, perhaps, the majority of diplomatists, he has an overweening dread of the consequences of any step which has not been looked at from every side and at leisure. Be this as it may, he was to be off to Khartoum to consult with General Gordon. But he did not go. Wednesday passed, and Thursday was dawdled away in conversation with Gordon's steamer crews; Friday came and went in the same aimless fashion; but on Friday night it was given out the steamers would certainly start in the morning, with some blue-jackets and some men of the Royal Sussex. The Saturday morning came, yet Sir Charles Wilson did not start. It was high noon on Saturday, the 24th, before he went, or three full days after he had given up the attempt on Metemmah, sixty-nine hours after the steamers had been reported to him as ready for him, and sixty-six hours after he had been urged to start by Khasm-el-Nus. Even when he did go, at noon on Saturday, the 24th, he insisted on stopping for the night just above the camp, under plea of wooding the two vessels, though they were crammed with wood enough for many days' steam-

ing—had, in point of fact, as much wood as they could fitly carry. We could not understand this delay then; it is still more difficult to understand it now, when it is known that Lord Wolseley had directed him to proceed to Khartoum forthwith. Here would appear to be not a question of nerve only, but of direct disobedience of orders. I have not the papers here, but by this time they have been published in England, and on reference they will be found to more than bear out the view now taken. If the instructions had been carried out, Sir Charles Wilson would have left Abu Kru on the afternoon of the 21st January; he would have reached Khartoum on the evening of the 24th or the morning of the 25th. Gordon was not sacrificed till the morning of the 26th. Sir Charles Wilson left on the afternoon of the 24th, really on the morning of the 25th, and sighted Khartoum on the morning of the 28th, or just forty-eight hours too late. Even when he did get there he made no serious effort to ascertain Gordon's fate. The bluejackets and Sussex men on board are positive upon the point that the steamers did not approach the city near enough to make sure of anything in it. Some put the distance at a mile; some say nearly two miles, when the steamers turned and ran down the river. Beresford would hardly have been content to come away, without learning something more than could be seen through long-distance telescopes and aluminium field-glasses. Perhaps it was because he was suspected of some such conduct that he was left behind. But one report that the steamers went within two hundred yards of Khartoum is absurd on the face of it, when we are told that there were batteries and thousands of riflemen playing upon the craft, and shells bursting on board. If this were so, how is it that neither steamer had a man hit in the very slightest way? The truth is the steamers ran for it, taking more care to get out of range than to find out the facts. That they were both wrecked when well on their way down is quite on a piece with the rest of the story. Had an officer of nerve been in command neither would have been lost; or if the first had been, as the native witnesses at the court-martial admitted she was, lost deliberately, the captain and pilot would have been shot out of hand instead of their escape being permitted, and the lesson would have secured the safety of her consort.

When the news came down in the grey of one morning, the committee commanding was at its wits' end. It issued an injunction that the story should be kept secret. Within twenty minutes a private in the Household Cavalry woke me with it; in half an hour it was all over the camp. There was not a man who did not feel inclined to shed tears—only it seemed too bad to be true. And then the instinct of the men fastened on the one point of hope. If the steamers had not had a man even wounded they could not have run the gauntlet of all the batteries reported; consequently they could not have been where they were alleged to have gone, therefore they could not have ascer-

tained the facts accurately; and Gordon had, after all, probably fortified himself in the church which he had turned into a magazine, and was holding out till the steamers and troops got up to him. Small as the force at Abu Kru then was—it had been depleted to find guards for convoys, and did not exceed 800 men—it would have willingly marched on Khartoum that morning if the word had been given. But the committee commanding made no sign. It had no more notion of what could or should be done than a bugler. It could only leave Lord Charles Beresford to his own devices with his two remaining steamers, and leave Major Dorward to throw up more earthworks and improve into impalpable dust those he had already made. If it had not been for Lieutenant-Colonel Barrow, commanding the 19th Hussars, and Major F. Wardrop, of the 3rd Dragoon Guards, Assistant Adjutant-General, the vitality of the camp must have come to an end. Lord Airlie, the Brigade-Major, had been twice wounded, and one of his wounds was so troublesome that he had to lie up, but so far as he could he kept the ball alive. Practically the column was paralysed. People kept on saying to one another that it was high time General Buller came, and not without reinforcements; in fact we lived from day to day a whole brigade of Micawbers. And all this came about because we had the ill-luck to have one officer killed and another wounded. When the want of nerve of Sir C. Wilson had borne its fruits and Gordon had been sacrificed, there was nobody in the force who had applied his mind to the contemplation of such a state of things, though it was, and had for months been, liable to occur from day to day. Everyone admitted that Lord Wolseley and the Government must have forethought what should be done in the event of the fall of Khartoum, but nobody was informed as to the result of that forethought. Chaos had come again when Sir G. Wilson was rescued by the heroism of Beresford and Benbow, and started for Korti to see General Wolseley, whose side it would have been well he had never left. But Major Kitchener, who would never have blundered like his chief, had been kept as adviser and Intelligence Officer at Korti; and as to Sir C. Wilson would have fallen the honour of rescuing, so on him must rest the responsibility for losing Charles Gordon. Even at the last moment he might have recovered, if not the advantages he had squandered, at least the prestige he forfeited. It never seems to have occurred to him to show a white flag on his leading steamer as an indication that he wished to open communication with the occupants of Khartoum. It is said that they would not have recognised it—that they are too barbarous to respect the custom which has obtained for centuries among civilised people, and so forth. But no harm would have been done by trying, and, as a matter of detail, Sir Redvers Buller had a letter sent to him at Abu Klea under the very white flag of which we are told the Mahdi's followers do not know the meaning. Nay, when Captain Pigott, of the

Mounted Infantry, took Buller's reply, and was fired upon, the firing ceased the moment he shook a white kerchief in the wind. Therefore we have no right to say Sir Charles Wilson's overturing of a white flag at Khartoum would have been ignored; but somebody has said that there was a good deal more of the white feather than of the white flag at this time. Far be it from me to say so much of the man who rode so coolly from the second zeroaba to the Nile when he was at length induced to go, or who exposed himself—and his troops—unnecessarily at Metemmah on the 21st January. Still, if he had plenty of courage, he had no presence of mind in face of a contingency which he, as well as his chief and the Administration, must have contemplated; and the result was that he left the vicinity of Khartoum as ignorant of Gordon's fate and of the facts of the surrender as before he sighted the blending waters of the two Niles. There is one more count in the charge which has been made against Sir Charles Wilson. He had opened up frequent communications with Gordon; but he never appears to have, as it were, sealed Gordon's promises to the chief native officers. They had, rightly or wrongly, conceived the idea that, like Othello, they would find their occupation gone when the British troops reached the goal of their efforts and raised the siege. They had Gordon's word that they would have their reward, but that word was never endorsed by the agents of the Government outside. It could in any case have done no harm; it now seems it might have done very much good had rewards been promised to those who so long had held out shoulder to shoulder with Gordon. But though inquiry has been made, no trace of any such idea, to say nothing of any such message, has been found in the Intelligence Department.

The case is sufficiently strong, however, without pressing home the latter point. I have shown that the loss of Gordon is directly traceable to two co-ordinate causes. First, Sir Charles Wilson's army seniority, which enabled him, knowing nothing of the science of war, to take the command of a force operating in the field at a critical juncture, and thus get rid of the importunity with which any capable and dashing soldier would have urged him to lose not a moment in going to Khartoum. Had anyone else been in command and in possession of Lord Wolseley's wishes and orders, it is inconceivable that Sir Charles Wilson would have been allowed to dawdle for three full days at Abu Kru, or that he would have been permitted to fly in the face of his instructions so far as to not only not proceed forthwith, but actually leave behind the very man who had been chosen by the General Commanding in Chief to see him through. Secondly, the extraordinary want of nerve which prevented him from seeing what a risk he was running, if only with his own reputation, by hanging about at Abu Kru instead of proceeding forthwith in the steamers which had kept the appointment he had himself made. The first of

these causes arises from the very absurd system which enables officers of the Royal Engineers to devote their lives to civil pursuits, while ignoring entirely the progress and the practice of military science, and at the same time to rise to rank and the chances of command over the heads of men who have been doing the practical work of soldiers and risking their lives over, perhaps, a quarter of a century. Is it too much to hope that this hideous example of the effects of the system may not mend it, but end it? The Royal Engineers stand conspicuously to the front as enjoying the privilege of gaining army rank without doing army service; but they are not alone in this very scandalous privilege, and whether in their case or that of any other corps, the existence of such a right should be determined at once and for all. From the second cause we learn, I think, that a diplomatic mission, supported by a military force, ought never to be left in diplomatic hands. Hesitation is the "note" of diplomacy, and in a crisis in the field hesitation is fatal. The man whose business it is to take prompt decisions is the man who ought to have the last word and the power of doing the last act in the presence of danger. Our practice hitherto has been mainly the other way. We are told now by the Intelligence Department that Khartoum would have fallen, Gordon been betrayed and murdered, or a prisoner, and the Mahdi master of the place, even if Sir Charles Wilson and the steamers had arrived on the 24th, as they ought, instead of merely starting on that day. But I am sure Lord Wolseley believes no nonsense of this sort, which has been originated in the fertile brains of those half-bred Circassians who are the curse of the Egyptian, as they are of the Turkish, public service. The story that Faragh Pacha and the rest of them preferred to trust the Mahdi rather than the English is one which far-seeing diplomacy might have anticipated and guarded against, as I have before suggested, by sending them confirmation of all Gordon's promises. But to suppose that they could have chosen their own time for betraying Gordon is to imagine they were the sole factors in the situation. They must have had to take their measures to blind Gordon and to persuade their troops as well. Besides, is it not true Sir Charles Wilson has himself said with a deep sigh that if he had got to Khartoum in time the disaster would not have occurred? But why did he not get there in time? I have shown in the fullest detail why, and I confidently refer to the Parliamentary Papers which, in the nature of the case, I cannot have seen, to bear out my statements. They have not been made except under a deep sense of responsibility; they are true in substance and in fact. But do I, therefore, urge that any measure of punishment should be meted out to Sir Charles Wilson? Far from it. I can conceive no punishment for him equal to the calm afterthought of what might have been had he only possessed nerve, had he not inexcusably dawdled, had he even carried out the instructions

with which he crossed the desert, and which he would have been compelled to carry out had not fate unhappily made him, by virtue of his nominal army seniority, absolute master of his actions.

With the news of his loss all the romance faded from the expedition in the minds of the troops. What to them was or is Khartoum more than any other town in the middle of Africa, but for the nimbus that the heroism, and devotion, and isolation of Gordon had cast around it? And now they have learnt with surprise that has, so to say, a deep black border of regret, of the intention of the Government of England to take Khartoum in the autumn, after the avowed motive for taking it at all has been eliminated. Let there be no mistake about it; the prosecution of the war is thoroughly and hopelessly unpopular among all sorts and conditions of British men on the Nile. If I may not say that it is continued against the advice of Lord Wolseley, I believe it is true at least that he has not recommended it should be carried on. Those who are apt to know his mind make no secret about the opinion that it will involve a waste of money, life, and energy which might be much better employed in much worthier spheres of action. Some of them go so far as to speak of the retention of the troops in the midst of the Soudan during the next four or five months as a phase of midsummer madness. Nowhere does one hear a word in support of the plan save the grim remark that this is a fine policy for soldiers, as pay and promotion and chances of distinction must arise even out of a prolonged Soudan campaign. Whether that is quite the point of view which will commend itself to the English people is another thing; and English soldiers are English citizens, with prejudices, passions, and opinions like the rest of their countrymen. They have, moreover, conceived a sort of respect for their opponents here. If the followers of the Mahdi do not know how to believe in the Kaliph of Stamboul, at least they know how to fight and how to die. They have conquered the esteem of those who have been shooting them down willingly so long as there was any hope of getting Gordon out of their clutches. For that end no sacrifice, personal or national, was deemed too great by the army. But what remains now? To avenge his death? Would a policy of revenge have commended itself to him? To secure the Soudan? What use is it to us, or to anybody but the natives, who get out of it all it can give? To defend Egypt? Have we it not on the authority of the Government itself that Egypt can best be defended by a line drawn beyond the deserts of the Batn-el-Hagar and Wady Halfa? To exterminate the slave-trade? Yet is it not true that we have approved of its authorised revival, so far as legalising the possession of slaves anyhow acquired can go? And if we are in earnest about this, had we not better begin in Cairo than in Khartoum? It is the conviction of the army on the Nile that, bad as the outcome of the enterprise has been, the last state of the expedition will be worse

than the first if it is persevered with. I have found no Englishman in the Soudan and the army who can bring himself to believe the country will allow the autumn campaign to go on when it comes to realise what is incant and involved in its prosecution. Do we annex the Soudan, or do we not? If we do, then must it be said that the game is not worth the candle; if we do not, what are we lingering here for? The game is not worth playing, because not only has the prestige of the Mahdi been mightily augmented by recent events, but his material resources have been increased in no less proportion. He had, at the most, to last him from the time of Hicks's defeat till the end of January, seven Krupp guns, six Nordenfelts, and twenty-nine brass pieces, smooth-bored or rifled. Of these he had the seven Krupps, with four Nordenfelts and twelve or thirteen brass pieces of sorts, firing on Khartoum. But there he took twelve Krupp guns mounted on the lines, with six Nordenfelts. He has, therefore, besides mountain guns, nineteen Krupps and twelve Nordenfelts; and as he had from Hicks's and Baker's forces about 17,000 Remington rifles, he may be taken now to have thrice that number. Then he took, before January last, a million of Remington cartridges, and about 200 rounds per gun of field ammunition. Supposing that to have been all exhausted in his campaigns, we know that he took 20,000 rounds of ammunition for his guns in Khartoum, and 2,000,000 Remington cartridges, and we must lay our account with this quantity at least. Then he has the arsenal at Khartoum, and he has Gordon's trained artificers, while he has two energetic and ingenious Europeans to devise work for them. Doubtless his resources are limited, in the sense that he must come to the end of them, and cannot reasonably hope to replace what he expends. But at the worst he has only to retire to the waterless country of Kordofan, where we cannot follow him, do what we will. Do we see the end of this policy of adventure? If we guarantee Egypt, is it not enough to hold Suakin and Wady Halfa, thus, with the help of Italy, taking care of the Red Sea ports, and so scotching any attempt to revive the slave trade? As for extending our trade, let this be said distinctly: the people of the Soudan grow their own cotton and weave their own cloth. Not one-tenth of the very limited consumption of textile manufactures comes from abroad; and as for nicknacks, and what we call Sheffield and Birmingham goods, the little which reaches the very inferior bazaars is rubbish of Austrian or German origin, and if poor is cheap. Luxuries in any European sense of the word are unknown, and if they were known, there is no money to buy them. In very truth the best thing for us to do with the Soudan is to quit it now, when a European crisis appears to impend, and for ever, and never to give it another thought save in connection with the memory of Charles Gordon, and a sigh of regret over "the saddest words of tongue or pen, 'What might have been.'" CHARLES WILLIAMS.

II.—IN MEMORIAM.

I.

On through the Libyan sand
Rolls ever, mile on mile,
League on long league, cleaving the rainless land,
Fed by no friendly wave, the immemorial Nile.

II.

Down through the cloudless air,
Undimmed, from heaven's sheer height,
Bend their inscrutable gaze, austere and bare,
In long-proceeding pomp, the stars of Libyan night.

III.

Beneath the stars, beside the unpausing flood,
Earth trembles at the wandering lion's roar ;
Trembles again, when in blind thirst of blood
Sweep the wild tribes along the startled shore.

IV.

They sweep and surge and struggle, and are gone :
The mournful desert silence reigns again,
The immemorial River rolleth on,
The ordered stars gaze blank upon the plain.

V.

O awful Presence of the lonely Nile,
O awful Presence of the starry sky,
Lo; in this little while
Unto the mind's true-seeing inward eye
There hath arisen there
Another haunting Presence as sublime,
As great, as sternly fair ;
Yea, rather fairer far
Than stream, or sky, or star,
To live while star shall burn or river roll,
Unmarred by marring Time,
The crown of Being, a heroic soul.

VI.

Beyond the weltering tides of worldly change
He saw the invisible things,
The eternal Forms of Beauty and of Right ;
Wherewith well pleased his spirit wont to range,
Rapt with divine delight,
Richer than empires, royaler than kings.

VII.

Lover of children, lord of fiery fight,
 Saviour of empires, servant of the poor,
 Not in the sordid scales of earth, unsure,
 Depraved, adulterate,
 He measured small and great,
 But by some righteous balance wrought in heaven,
 To his pure hand by Powers empyreal given;
 Therewith, by men unmoved, as God he judged aright.

VIII.

As on the broad sweet-watered river tost
 Falls some poor grain of salt,
 And melts to naught, nor leaves embittering trace;
 As in the o'er-arching vault
 With unrepelled assault
 A cloudy climbing vapour, lightly lost,
 Vanisheth utterly in the starry space;
 So from our thought, when his enthroned estate
 We inly contemplate,
 All wrangling phantoms fade, and leave us face to face.

IX.

Dwell in us, sacred spirit, as in thee
 Dwelt the eternal Love, the eternal Life,
 Nor dwelt in only thee; not thee alone
 We honour reverently,
 But in thee all who in some succouring strife,
 By day or dark, world-witnessed or unknown,
 Crushed by the crowd, or in late harvest hailed,
 Warring thy war have triumphed, or have failed.

X.

Nay, but not only there
 Broods thy great Presence, o'er the Libyan plain.
 It haunts a kindlier clime, a dearer air,
 The liberal air of England, thy loved home.
 Thou through her sunlit clouds and flying rain
 Breathe, and all winds that sweep her island shore—
 Rough fields of riven foam,
 Where in stern watch her guardian breakers roar.
 Ay, throned with all her mighty memories,
 Whence from her nobler sons their nurture draw,
 With all of good or great
 For aye incorporate
 That rears her race to faith and generous shame,
 To high-aspiring awe,
 To hate implacable of thick-thronging lies,
 To scorn of gold and gauds and clamorous fame—
 With all we guard most dear and most divine,
 All records ranked with thine,
 Here be thy home, brave soul, thy undecaying shrine.

ERNEST MYERS.

BUDDHISM AND MOCK BUDDHISM.

"How easily these old worships of Moses, of Zoroaster, of Menu, of Socrates domesticate themselves in the mind," exclaims Emerson; "I cannot find any antiquity in them. They are mine as much as theirs." The student of ancient Indian religious thought will constantly be impelled to this exclamation. And with Buddhism especially he must feel that, behind the Eastern garb of mystical imagery, there dwells a spirit whose touch can reach him, a citizen of the modern Western world, and whose voice can move him strangely, deeply, intimately, like the familiar touch and voice of a friend. Now the special interest that Buddhism possesses for European students has frequently been insisted upon; and, if the truth must be told, has sometimes been claimed upon insufficient grounds. Struck by the unmistakably beautiful figure of the founder of this ancient religion, the Western critic has, not unnaturally, been tempted to compare this perfect human character with his own ideal of perfection; and we have, for instance, the devout Roman Catholic Bishop of Ava, the good Abbé Bigandet, unhesitatingly comparing the all-embracing humanity of Buddha with the divine and boundless compassion of Christ. These comparisons, however generous and creditable to the impartial and tolerant spirit of earnest and orthodox Christians making them, are nevertheless a little perilous and misleading. The resemblances that can indubitably be traced between Buddhism and Christianity are only those we should expect to find between two systems whose founders were both lovers of mankind, and who both looked at life from the spiritual side. That Buddha, five hundred years before the Christian era, preached the equality of all men, the duty of forgiving injuries, the emptiness of formal worship and sacrifices, the vanity of worldly avarice and ambition, all this only proves that he reached on these points the conclusions the spiritually-minded must reach. Still less is there anything remarkable in the fact often put forward as an astonishing coincidence by unreflecting persons, that Buddhism, five centuries before the Catholic Church was heard of, had its monasteries and religious orders of nuns as well as of monks. Before Buddhism was heard of, Brahmanism had its female and male ascetics, living either as solitaries or in communities; in fact, in the East from time immemorial the renunciation of worldly ties, and vows of poverty, chastity, and self-denial, have been considered the necessary conditions of the religious life.

But when we consider the distinguishing and essential features of

Buddhism and Christianity as religious systems we find that they are not alike, but different; and this necessarily since the one rests upon a human, and the other upon a superhuman foundation. The Buddha is no Saviour able to take man's sins upon his shoulders, and to share with him divine merits; he is a merely human teacher—a man who, having discovered and uprooted in himself the causes of unrest, misery, and error, comes to his fellow-men, not to save them, but to teach each man how he may save himself. So that we have here two starting points directly opposed to each other: the Christian must, to commence with, be convinced of his own helplessness and need of a Saviour; the Buddhist, on the other hand, must realise, not only that he is able to save himself, but that no one else can save him. "Purity and impurity belong to oneself," says the *Dhamma-pada*; "no one can purify another." And as the starting points are different, so the methods and goals are different. The Christian, through divine grace, and not by his own merits, receives compensation for the evils of this present life in another world, where death and sorrow and pain cannot enter; the method is one of self-abandonment and faith, the goal is in a future life. But the Buddhist has no promise of external grace, nor of any better world. Here and now he must conquer for himself, not another state, but a higher mind—"one not to be changed by place or time;" and he must do this unaided. "Well-makers lead the water where they will; the fletcher bends the arrow; the carpenter fashions the log of wood; the wise man shapes himself."¹ But when the wise man's work is done he holds his victory and the fruits of his victory, not as a gift beyond his deserving, but as a conquered right. "Not Mara, with Brahma, can change into defeat the victory of a man who has vanquished himself."² The attempt, then, to reconcile this system with Christianity resembles Mr. Matthew Arnold's ingenious efforts to prove that "morality lighted up with emotion" is a definition that includes all the essential characteristics of the Christian doctrine; and that "a Power not ourselves, that makes for righteousness," expresses the same idea as the Christian's conception of a Father in heaven, by whom "the very hairs in his head are numbered." It is, as it seems to us, much better at the outset clearly to recognise that Buddhism is a purely human system of self-culture and improvement; and that for those who from a religion expect an adequate explanation of the mysteries that lie beyond the sphere of human experience Buddhism cannot properly be described as a religion at all.

At the same time it is something more than a philosophical system. Buddhism not only fulfils Mr. Matthew Arnold's condition of "lighting up morality," it also "lights up" the life of thought. By its faith in the sovereignty of mind in man more dignity and more

(1) *Dhamma-paṇi*, 145.(2) *Ibid*, 104.

responsibility are given to the intellect. Perfection is in a mental state, but to this mental perfectness and peace, moral perfectness and purity are necessary; therefore neither moral fervour nor solemn spiritual force are wanting to the Buddhist's ideal of the perfect life. This teaching of "the Awakened" that bids men "cultivate solitude and dwell on the highest thoughts" as a religious exercise, and that makes the higher life one of intellectual power and perfectness, cannot but impress us with its strange resemblance to the faith of our latter-day Idealists. Mr. Matthew Arnold, in slightly different words, gives us as our method of culture this same rule of "dwelling on the highest thoughts."¹ Professor Seeley, in describing natural religion from the modern point of view, sets forth a definition that reads like a frigid Western version of the intellectual creed of the Eastern mystic.² But we must not prepare disappointment for ourselves by imagining that all distances of time and space are annihilated, and that Gotama Buddha, who has attained Nirvana under the shadow of the sacred Bo Tree, will not only think the same thoughts but speak in the same tone as a Western apostle of culture, who carries out his vocation of "acquainting himself with the best that is known and thought in the world" in a well-appointed library. It seems necessary to say this because whilst, on the one hand, we have some people who appear to think that Buddhism can quite easily be dug out of the ancient world and transplanted bodily (like the Japanese Village), if not for the enlightenment of the West, then for the entertainment of the West End, other critics, again, are ready to complain that too much is made of the spiritual relationship Buddhism bears to modern thought; and to conclude that those who recognise this impressive relationship are either wilfully or foolishly blind to patent differences, that, as they are evident to the most casual observers, one would think do not need to be insisted upon.

That Buddhism kindles with spiritual enthusiasm a system, founded on self-reliance, with a method of self-conquest and culture, and the goal in self-deliverance, and a refuge in the higher nature from the slavish impulses and instincts of the lower is, then, the fact that appeals to us, and claims our admiration and sympathy. But it is not of course assumed that this pure religion of the intellect exists now, or perhaps ever existed, away from the immediate influence of the Master himself, without any alloy of inherited superstition or later perversions and corruptions. We must bear in mind that whilst Gotama was an exceptionally gifted being, he yet lived and preached amongst the same scenes and influences as his contemporaries. What Christianity is to the latter-day idealist Brahmanism was to him. It was the school in which his original mind formed itself; and though he neglected many of the precepts learnt in this school, and

(1) *Function of Criticism*, p. 15.

(2) *Natural Religion*, p. 1.

broke with the dogmas he held untrue or unnecessary, yet associations and impressions clung to him. Indeed, we cannot rightly understand what was personal and original in the Buddha's teaching without some knowledge also of what was inevitably bound up with it—the ideal influences that were in the air the teacher breathed, made up of the convictions, aspirations, and questionings of his contemporaries. We may take the sacred Bo Tree as a symbol of the overshadowing spirit of ancient India, deep rooted in Pantheism, and flowering out into fantastic leafage and blossom; and we must expect to find this shadow upon Buddhism, as upon all the religions born under or brought within reach of its influence. Only, in the case of Buddhism, it is possible to penetrate beneath the tree, as it were. There the pure unsullied mind of the "Tathāgata," is as a pool of transparent water. We may test the water and taste it, and prove it to have taken no colour or taint from the fantastic reflections cast upon its surface.

But when we say it is possible to do this, and to discover without mistake what the purport of Gotāma's teaching actually was, we speak of a possibility that has come into existence for the Western student only recently. The magnificent translations of early Eastern Scriptures we owe to such Oriental scholars as Professor Max Müller, Dr. Bühler, Dr. Fausbøll and, where Buddhism is concerned, especially to Dr. Rhys Davids, have effected a complete change in the position of students of Buddhism, who before had to content themselves with a literature of speculations and commentaries. We may quote Dr. Rhys Davids to show that we do not overrate the importance of recent researches and discoveries in throwing new light upon the true significance of Buddha's doctrine. "It is not too much to say," writes Dr. Rhys Davids, in his preface to the eleventh volume of the *Sacred Books of the East*, "that the discovery of early Buddhism has placed all previous knowledge of the subject in an entirely new light, and has turned the flank, so to speak, of most of the existing literature on Buddhism. I use the term 'discovery' advisedly, for though the Pāli texts have existed for many years in our public libraries, they are only now beginning to be understood; and the Buddhism of the Pāli Pitakas is not only a quite different thing from Buddhism as hitherto received, but is antagonistic to it."

Now the Pāli Pitakas may not have the supreme antiquity some scholars are disposed to claim for them; but happily our present purpose does not require from us any decision on vexed questions of Buddhist chronology. All that we, as seekers after the heart and spiritual sense of ancient Buddhism, are concerned to know is that the Tri-pitaka (or three baskets of the law that constitute the early Buddhist canon) must be accepted as *the oldest and most faithful record we have of Gotāma Buddha and of his doctrine*. Of these "three baskets"—the *Vinaya Pitaka*, or book of rules and discipline; the *Abhidharma Pitaka*, or

treatise on Buddhist metaphysics; and lastly, the Sutta Pitaka, the record of Gotama's sermons and discourses—the last is, as we should expect, the one in which the true Buddha shines out most clearly. Naturally, the reverence and love of his Bhikshus would have taught them to treasure carefully the very words uttered by their master; and so the report of the discourses would be free from those exaggerations that the heated fancy and unwise worship of the relater would introduce into any narrative of events. And it is in the suttas or discourses of Buddha that we find this pure unalloyed religion of the intellect free from any taint of superstition or shadow of supernaturalism. How luminous, how high, how peaceful, is the mind of the Eastern sage that reaches us, for instance, through the beautiful texts of the *Dhamma-pada*! The twenty-five suttas (sermons) composing the *Dhamma-pada* have evidently been brought together to give in a convenient form a summary of the essential Buddhist doctrine; but they also seem composed with an intimate knowledge of the spiritual needs and finest impulses of the modern mind. In the *Dhamma-pada* we have the motive and goal of Buddhism. In the short but beautiful sutta entitled the "Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness" (*Dhamma-kakka-ppavatana-Sutta*) we have the method explained. Both of these essential works impress the student with a sense of familiarity; texts and indeed whole chapters might pass readily for extracts from the writings of Mr. Pater, Mr. Matthew Arnold or some other of our latter-day idealists. What is the "Foundation" upon which the wise man's kingdom rests? Nothing can be simpler, more intelligible, less mystical. Upon moderation to begin with, a middle path between self-indulgence and asceticism, the "noble eight-fold path," as it is called, that consists of eight right or just principles embracing all thought and action. Then on the destruction of selfish desires, and the translation of interests and affections from the troubled sphere of sense and emotion into the sage and quiet domain of mind and spirit.¹

In the *Dhamma-pada* and "The Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness" we have the positive side of Buddha's doctrine. The *Tevigga Sutta*, or "Sermon on the Knowledge of the Vedas," will give us a good idea of the negative side; in other words, of what Buddha rejected, without compromise, and of what doctrines from the older faith of Brahmanism he was willing to tolerate, and even to utilise for the benefit of the weaker brethren. No honest and careful student of Gotama Buddha's doctrine can be in any serious doubt as to the view he took of miracles and magical performances generally. Born in an age and land where these practices were firmly believed in and highly esteemed, Gotama

(1) "The life-long effort to tranquillise vehement emotions by withdrawing them into the region of ideal sentiment."—*Vide Renaissance*, p. 92, W. H. Pater.

from the outset sternly discouraged all exhibitions of miraculous powers by his disciples. *We have in the life of Buddha the long and most instructive episode of Devadatta the miracle-worker, the Judas of the order, to prove that the Master had nothing but scornful dislike for these performances. But the legend of Devadatta of course belongs to that portion of the faith on which, as has been said, the fantastic imagination of ancient India has cast strange reflections. This observation applies to all stories of the Buddha's life, and to every record of events passing around him. Only to the Master's own words must we look if we wish to find the pure and unsullied truth. And in the *Tevigga Sutta* we have the facts, indicated by the legend, confirmed by the Buddha himself. In this sutta he sums up all the wonders performed by the miracle-workers of his day; no distinctions are made in favour of any (such as thought-reading, the discovery of hidden treasures, magical mirrors, &c.), but one and all are declared to be "*low arts and lying practices from which the true disciple will refrain.*"¹ It should be observed he is at no pains to distinguish between "low arts and lying practices." He does not feel himself in any way bound to decide whether, to use the modern phrase, "there is something in" these miracles beyond sheer imposture. To the Buddha, with his religion "founded upon thought, made up of thought," it is a matter of no importance. There is *nothing* in them that can by any means be of use or profit in the spiritual and intellectual sphere, and so he dismisses these "low arts and lying practices" with "dancing," with lewd conversation and foolish talk," with "bribery, cheating, highway robbery," and other disgraceful and discreditable acts, in which a true Bhikshu or a lay follower who respects himself will take no part.

Now this chapter of the *Tevigga Sutta* should alone suffice to disprove once for all the claims of a new religion or religionette, that, fortunately and unfortunately for itself, has seen fit to take the name of Esoteric Buddhism: fortunately, because by putting forward the name of the great wise man of the East the little creed has obtained more notice than it could by its own merits have secured; and unfortunately, because by taking this revered name in vain it has excited more wrath than such a very little creed deserved. One feels a certain reluctance and remorse in bringing the full weight of the evidence at one's disposal to bear against this frail, ephemeral, modern Theosophy, tricked out in an ill-fitting Bhikshu's garb, and using in a false sense some Buddhist terms and texts imperfectly committed to memory. Good-nature at first prompts compassion for this transparent impostor. "Cease masquerading in that stolen dress," the serious student of Buddhism is tempted to say to this childish disturber

(1) Vide "*Tevigga Sutta*," p. 192. *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xi.

of his researches, "and only carry on your play with buried tea-cups, and precipitated letters, and flying lumps of plaster of Paris, a little further off—do this, and I have no quarrel with you."

Unfortunately, however, the serious student is not free to keep this placid and indifferent mood. At the very hour when Oriental scholars, who are also men of literary genius—(Dr. Rhys David's *Buddhist Suttas* are as beautiful reading and have the same charm as Professor Jowett's *Plato*, the charm of sweet English worn by thoughts rare and strange)—at this hour, when such gifted scholars have brought us home these true treasures of ancient thought, comes this masquerading Theosophy, with its foolish miracles and gospel sent by "psychological telegraphy," and actually diverts the attention of open-minded persons from the true to the false Buddhism. Under these circumstances remorse and good-nature are out of place; it becomes a duty, if not a very heroic one, to strip off the Bhikshu's garb and bid this modern religionette resume its first dress and call itself again by its first singularly appropriate name of "Occultism."

So much, then, being said to excuse the apparent cruelty of dealing seriously with the claims of "Esoteric Buddhism," we may proceed to examine the titles of this so-called "religion" to be accepted as having any right to the name at all—any right, that is, to be regarded as representing a system of thought and body of belief which, whether wise or unwise, have actually been handed down from remote times to living men associated in this religion, and preserving its traditions in our own day.

We are compelled to take this preliminary step before comparing the Esoteric doctrine with Buddhism as expounded in the *Tripitaka*, because the Annon of this new movement does not hesitate to blow aside the authority of these ancient scriptures, as being of light weight compared with the secret doctrine that (he assumes) has been preserved for countless ages, as "a mine of entirely trustworthy knowledge, from which" (not only Buddhism), but all religions and philosophies have derived whatever they possess of truth, and with which every religion must coincide, if it claims to be a mode of expression of truth."

"Buddhism," the writer goes on to say, "is a religion which has enjoyed a dual existence from the very beginning of its introduction to the world. The real inner meaning of its doctrines has been kept back from uninitiated students, while the outer teachings have merely presented the multitude with a code of moral lessons and a veiled symbolical literature hinting at the existence of knowledge in the background. This secret knowledge in reality long antedated the passage through earth-life of Gotama Buddha . . . Its outlines had indeed been blurred, its scientific form partially confused, but the general body of knowledge was already in possession of a select few

before Buddha came to deal with it. Buddha, however, undertook the task of revising and refreshing the esoteric science of the inner circle of initiates, as well as the morality of the outer world."

But what reasons have we for believing in this "mine of entirely trustworthy knowledge" that enables modern triflers to decide what Gotama Buddha taught, or in any case what he ought to have taught, with more authority than can be claimed by patient scholars who have merely acquired Oriental languages, and hunted out faded MSS. and been at the long, laborious, and painful process—far inferior, of course, to psychological telegraphy—of mastering their meaning and translating it? So far as the English public are concerned, the evidence of the author of the *Occult World* and of *Esoteric Buddhism* is all that need be considered, since this gentleman is the chosen spokesman and delegate of Madame Blavatsky's Theosophical Society. In describing Mr. Sinnett as the Aaron of the Esoteric doctrine, we are giving him the exact position he claims. Mr. Sinnett is not himself an "adept," nor even a "chela," i.e. an aspirant towards adeptship; with perfect candour and composure he admits that he has no more claims to adeptship than he has to Oriental scholarship—this last qualification being one, nevertheless, that some people might regard as absolutely essential in the case of a critic who emits such very positive opinions on the researches of scholars. But life is short, and scholarship is long in the attaining; so it would seem is "adeptship;" and even "chelaship" is a matter of some seven years. Mr. Sinnett has not considered it necessary to pass through these ordeals. Whilst filling the post of editor of the *Anglo-Indian Pioneer* at Allahabad he became acquainted with Madame Blavatsky, the founder of the Theosophical Society. Madame Blavatsky, though not herself quite an adept, is one "to the extent of possessing the magnificent power of psychological telegraphy" with those fully-fledged adepts, the Tibetan Brotherhood, of whom so much has been heard lately; and who are the depositaries of the great Esoteric doctrine from which "all religions and philosophies have derived whatsoever they possess of truth." Madame Blavatsky not only possesses the magnificent gift of psychological telegraphy, but also "the power of producing other abnormal phenomena." Having during the course of two visits paid Mr. Sinnett at Allahabad, and at Simla, given her host many striking instances of this power, Madame Blavatsky (as the producer of abnormal phenomena) was proved, to Mr. Sinnett, a person on whose word implicit reliance could be placed. Madame Blavatsky then it was who told Mr. Sinnett about the Tibetan Brotherhood and the Esoteric doctrine, and even consented to put the editor of the *Pioneer* in communication with a Brother if he wished it. In the case of Mr. Sinnett, psychological telegraphy with the adepts is not, it would seem, the simple process it is with

Madame Blavatsky. Mr. Sinnett writes and seals his letter: and it vanishes (out of Madame Blavatsky's hands, by these early accounts at any rate) and is transported instantaneously to Tibet. The Brother "precipitates" his answer, and it is found, as a letter (written often enough on Mr. Sinnett's own note paper)¹, but hidden inside the feathers of a sofa cushion or in other out-of-the-way places. This occult correspondence, commenced in the way described, under Madame Blavatsky's auspices, is the foundation upon which Mr. Sinnett's authority to preach Esoteric Buddhism rests. Koot-Hoomi-Lal-Singh is the "Tibetan mystic name" of the Brother who first consented to become the instructor of the editor of the *Pioneer*, and who finally charged, or at any rate permitted, him to throw up his worldly vocation, and pass on the instruction thus conveyed to him to the Western world. It only remains to add that Mr. Sinnett has not deemed it necessary to visit Tibet, nor has he been brought into direct personal contact with the "adept guru" who has vouchsafed him all this valuable information. He has indeed been presented with a precipitated profile portrait of Koot Hoomi," produced by a "chela" in Madame Blavatsky's scrap book. This "precipitated profile portrait," and the letters conveyed by psychological currents from Tibet, and either dropped out of the air on Mr. Sinnett's head or discovered by him inside pillows, are the titles to belief in Koot Hoomi and his revelation, seriously put forward by the author of the *Occult World* as convincing and satisfactory to him, and hence as sufficient to convince and satisfy the rest of the world.

Without discussing the inherent credibility of these titles, we may draw attention to the fact that, whereas the foundations of the kingdom of righteousness preached by Buddha are in the spirit and intellect of man, these foundations of Esoteric Buddhism are in miracles or "occult phenomena," that put the intellect out of court altogether. Necessarily, there is antagonism between a religion that proves itself by phenomena, and a religion that regards all phenomena, occult or otherwise, as untrustworthy and illusory. For instance, the manifesto of this "new faith—the event corresponding, in other words, to the preaching of the sutta, "The Foundation of the Kingdom of Righteousness"—was the discovery of a tea-cup buried in the Himalayas, and supposed to have been created at the solicitation of Madame Blavatsky by one of the Tibetan Brothers, for the conversion and convenience of Mr. Sinnett and his guests on the occasion of a picnic.

We know by the *Tevigga Sutta* what would have been the Buddha's attitude with regard to this tea-cup. He would not have been at the pains of inquiring whether its burial in the mountain-side was an occult or a simple phenomenon. If the Tibetan Brother had really

(1) Vide *Occult World*, p. 97.

created, or doubled, this tea-cup, and exerted himself to convey it from Tibet to the neighbourhood of Simla, then he had stooped to practising a "low art," that, far from proving him a superior being, showed he wasted his time and energies on performances worth as much as "dancing," "foolish talk," &c., instead of devoting himself to spiritual and intellectual matters. On the other hand, if the Tibetan Brother had no hand in the burial of the tea-cup, then its discovery was not the result of "low art," but of a . . . but really it is not necessary to say of what. In either case, this occult phenomenon was of no value and could prove nothing in the intellectual and spiritual sphere.

So much then for the titles and authority upon which the Esoteric doctrine rests. But now, as to this doctrine itself, and its pretensions to "explain the origin of the world and of man, the ultimate destinies of our race, and the nature of other worlds and states of existence differing from those of our present life."¹ As it happens, these are questions with which true Buddhism does not concern itself. "The knowledge of nature and cosmic conceptions," which Mr. Sinnett declares "constitute Esoteric Buddhism," would by Gotama have been relegated to the domain of impermanency and illusion, that lies outside the sphere of spiritual religion. "Buddhism," says Dr. Rhys Davids, "does not attempt to solve the problem of the primary origin of things. When Mahinka asked the Buddha whether the existence of the world is eternal or not eternal, he made him no reply; but the reason of this was, that it was considered by the Teacher a question that tended to no profit." Again, is it true that Buddhism has a hidden doctrine, held back from the uninitiated; and that this "secret knowledge" existed before the passage through earth-life of Gotama Buddha, and was merely revised and refreshed by him? No doubt, as has already been admitted, and even insisted upon, Buddha accepted and utilised many convictions and beliefs he found in existence; and this inheritance from Brahmanism explains a great many of the later superstitions that have defiled and obscured this pure religion of the intellect. But that the Buddha was the member of any secret association or brotherhood, a reformer instead of an original teacher and founder of a religion, is denied by him in his first sermon preached before the five Bhikshus who forsake the old schools to become his disciples. "And again, O Bhikshus!" he exclaims; "that this was the noble truth concerning the way which leads to the destruction of sorrow was not among the doctrines handed down; but there arose within me the eye, there arose the understanding, there arose the light" (v. 18, *Dhamma-kakka-P-Pacattana-Sutta*²). Quite as forcibly and directly does he refute in the Book of

(1) Preface to *Esoteric Buddhism*.

(2) Rhys-Davids's *Buddhist Suttas* (Sacred Book of the East), vol. xi.

the Great Decease the statement that he has any esoteric and secret doctrine reserved for the initiated. The Buddha is near to death, and Ananda, his favoured attendant and disciple, asks him if he has no last instructions to give, no secret doctrine to impart; and this is the Master's reply:—

"What then, Ananda, does the order expect that of me? I have preached the truth without making any distinction between exoteric and esoteric doctrine; for in respects of the truths, Ananda, the Tathagata has no such thing as the closed fist of a teacher who keeps some things back. . . . Whosoever then, Ananda, either now or after I am dead, shall be a lamp unto themselves and a refuge unto themselves, shall betake themselves to no external refuge, but holding fast to the truth as their lamp and holding fast as their refuge to the truth, shall not look for refuge to any beside themselves. It is they, Ananda, among my Bhikshus who shall reach the topmost height."—*Mahā-Parinibbāna Sutta*, v. 32, 35.

So then in this purely personal religion, where each must save himself, there is no need of any hierarchy or privileged priestly class, the depositaries of special knowledge, no select circle of "adepts" or "mahatmas," in Tibet or elsewhere. But this is not all. Later on in the same sutta we have the case foreseen when "elders of the order" may claim to introduce new doctrines, or to put different interpretations on the doctrines, than those generally received. The faithful are in this case commanded to compare these statements put forward by the elders with the scriptures (*i.e.* the Pitakas) and rules of the orders. "If when so compared they do not harmonise with the scripture, and do not fit in with the rules of the order, then you may come to this conclusion, Verily this is not the word of the Blessed One, and has been wrongly grasped by those elders; therefore, brethren, you should reject it" (*Mahā-Parinibbāna-Sutta*, v. 10).

To describe Mr. Sinnett's invisible Moses, Koot-Hoomi-Lal-Singh, as an "elder of the order," would be to allow oneself to be carried away by the too ardent faith and fancy of his spokesman and disciple. But without committing ourselves to any rash decision as to the personality or actual existence of this mysterious prophet, we have obeyed the command and compared "Esoteric Buddhism" (so called) with the Buddhism of the Pitakas, with this result: we are able to prove *all* the statements concerning the inner meaning and purpose of Gotama Buddha's teaching made through Mr. Sinnett by the Theosophical Society, or (if it be preferred) by the Tibetan Brotherhood, to be one by one baseless and false. We have shown by this method:—

Firstly. That whereas Mr. Sinnett bases his first claims for respect and belief in Madame Blavatsky and her friends in Tibet on her and their power to perform miracles, or "occult phenomena," Buddha pronounces these performances, not only of no worth as proofs in spiritual matters, but as discreditable to those who practise them, proving them addicted either to "low arts" or to "lying practices."

Secondly. That whereas, according to this new account, Buddha merely reformed and revised a "secret knowledge" handed down from remote times, Buddha in his very first sermon declares that no such knowledge has been handed down to him; and proclaims that he has conquered the knowledge of the truth for himself.

Thirdly. That whereas Mr. Sinnett asserts that Buddha had a secret and esoteric doctrine hidden from the multitude and reserved for initiates, Buddha distinctly denies that he has any esoteric doctrine or has held back any truths from the multitude.

Fourthly. That whereas the author of *Esoteric Buddhism* asserts that the final authority for Buddhism, as well as for all other religions, rests with a small number of men "possessed of spiritual faculties and perceptions of a higher order than those belonging to ordinary humanity," Gotama himself declares the "great reference" as to the truths of Buddhism to be the ancient scriptures, and forbids his disciples to accept new versions from elders who profess "to hold the faith as handed down by tradition."

Fifthly and lastly, it has been shown that whereas the purpose and promise of the Esoteric doctrine is to develop a power of producing occult phenomena and to give "precise knowledge of other worlds," "true not as shadowy religious truths or orthodox speculations are held to be true by their votaries, but true as the London Post Office Directory is true,"¹ the more modest purpose of true Buddhism is to urge men to practise self-control and self-culture, and its less ambitious promise the holding forth of the "sweet asylum of an intellectual life," as a refuge, not only from the pains and disappointments of this present material existence, but, if this hard lot is actually in store for us, from the *ennuis* of a future state, "true as the London Post Office Directory is true." Here then we may fairly hope sufficient reasons have been shown why this modern religionette should renounce the name of "Esoteric Buddhism" and resume its first title of Occultism, than which none could be found more appropriate, since it expresses an exactly opposite conception of religion to Buddhism, the creed of the Enlightened One.

And now, having done with controversy for the present, let us in conclusion turn to a subject it is usual to speak of as enveloped in mystery, but which the light of recent researches has set free from concealing clouds. It is no longer permissible to speak of Nirvana, the goal of the Buddhist higher life, as a mysterious or unintelligible state. What is true of the higher life is true also of the goal, Nirvana. It is difficult, for many of us perhaps impossible, to lead this life or to reach Nirvana; but it is not difficult to understand what this life is, nor where Nirvana can be found. It is really curious to hear Western critics, who presumably have minds, inquire what is

(1) Vide *The Occult World*, p. 140.

left if the life of the senses and of the emotions is blown out, and concluding that Nirvana must mean annihilation. To think is, when all is said, a human faculty, and the majority of human beings have some consciousness that they possess a mind. What is more, if we keep with the Buddha within the sphere of human experience, it is the mind we must take as the eternal and spiritual in man. Let us look back at the dead generations that have vanished from the earth. What is it that remains? Loves, sufferings, sorrows, joys, where are they? But thoughts still live. The heart and the stories of the heart are only memorable when the intellect has, as it were, adopted them, drawn them up out of their own perishable sphere, as the Greek legend says was done for Perseus and Andromeda, to live, not the troubled mortal life, but as shining stars.

Nirvana then is life as pure mind: 1st, the *goal and crown* of the higher life; and 2nd, the *refuge* of those who still tread the noble eight-fold path, and are bound by ties of duty, mercy, and love to the life that perishes. People either forget or fail to understand this difference between Nirvana as a refuge and Nirvana as a final goal when they object that Buddhism put in practice would be intellectual selfishness. The best answer to this objection is to point to Buddha himself. His life certainly was not a selfish one. And yet when he attains enlightenment he is said "to have entered Nirvana," and in the suttas the conquest of a tranquil mind is often spoken of as the attainment of Nirvana. But when Gotama reaches the Buddhahood, he does not enter into any ineffable trance; he does not spend his time in self-contemplation; he starts at once upon his mission of "instructing, inciting, and gladdening" other minds.

It is true that Gotama considers the "higher life" occupied only with spiritual interests, and here no doubt East and West clash. The homeless Bhikshu, living on the alms provided by the faithful, will not be our own ideal of the most perfect life. Yet why should a life of thought, of devotion to spiritual rather than material needs, be a more selfish or less humane life than one of action? The servant of the mind has a mission amongst men which, though its object is not in the practical sphere, yet makes him a labourer for others. Very strange is it to see even idealists, men who are themselves living the spiritual rather than the worldly life, shrink from acknowledging aloud that to live for the things of the mind is a lawful vocation. Even Mr. Ruskin, in the most beautiful and eloquent lecture he delivered some three years ago at the London Institution, when commending the Cistercian monks, and speaking with all the sympathy an idealist naturally feels for the religious life, selected for special praise in these monks the fact that they were excellent agriculturists, builders, &c. Carlyle, it will be remembered, follows the same path. His Abbot Sampson is before all things a practical

man, clever at finances, honest, energetic, and the rest. Surely there is some confusion of thought here. To praise one who has renounced the world for worldly acts that might have been performed in the world, is like commending a painter as a painter because he has made a pair of shoes well. "To work is to pray," say Ruskin and Carlyle; but this is the man of the world's motto—he prays by his works, serves heaven by making the world a better place. But the motto, the excuse, of those who leave the world to follow a spiritual vocation should be, "We work by our prayers, by our thoughts; serve the world by standing outside the noise and hurry, as witnesses for thought. Like Moses, holding up our hands, that the battle of life may be fought to better purpose."

The Buddhist solitary has understood better than the monks of the West this aim and direction of the religious life. But even Buddha recognised that this royal road to Nirvana was not for all; even Buddha has admitted that men may tread the noble eight-fold path in the world as well as out of it, and taste the tranquil peace of Nirvana without forsaking the city for the forest. Nirvana, then, is as regards our fellow-men and life in the world a new standpoint, giving a higher, calmer view, out of reach of personal passion, bitterness, and futile rebellion. It is the conquest of what Mr. Matthew Arnold calls sweet reasonableness, of what Gotama, who is Mr. Matthew Arnold "lighted up with emotion," describes as "a mind set free and heart of deep-felt love, pity, and equanimity." Then as regards ourselves. Nirvana is the conquest of a refuge in the mind from the cares and pains of the personal life; it is the discovery of Emerson's "sweet asylum of an intellectual life," an asylum where we may withdraw ourselves and find companionship with the highest thoughts, and of whose security and peace no external fate or fortune, "not Mara with Brahma can rob us." And lastly, Nirvana is the immortality that without selfishness we may desire, and without any superhuman evidence we may believe in. But here not even Gotama Buddha has expressed the aspiration so plainly and nobly as a modern idealist. George Eliot's hope to live "in thoughts sublime that pierce the night like stars, and with their mild persistence urge man's search to vaster issues," is the most perfect, as it is the most poetical, description of Nirvana.

FREDERIKA MACDONALD.

UNION OF PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

THE divided state of Presbyterianism in Scotland has long been a source of surprise, of regret, and of reproach. The ordinary observer wonders how it happens that, with similarity or identity of doctrine and Church government, such separation should be maintained; others, more closely interested, deplore the waste and overlapping of effort produced by a state of things which is in itself at the same time unedifying; while by others the matter is regarded chiefly as affording a convenient illustration of ecclesiastical prejudice and impracticability.

To suppose, however, that the outward similarity of the various Presbyterian bodies indicates that the underlying causes of their separation are slight or easily to be overcome would imply acquaintance with Scottish ecclesiastical history. The facts, however, are tolerably familiar to all who are likely to be interested in the subject. It is with the present aspect of the question that I am now concerned. I may safely affirm that at no period since the great secession of 1843 has there been so general a disposition as at present to dwell upon the various points of agreement rather than those of difference, and to contemplate favourably the possibilities of union. Nor is this disposition due to the hopes or fears with which the vision of disestablishment may have been regarded by the Established and non-established Churches respectively; rather is it to be attributed to an increased breadth of view, and to a more enlightened and charitable mode of surveying the whole subject, combined with an increased earnestness and spirituality, producing a desire to remove whatever unnecessary barriers are hindering the advance of religion and the best interests of the country.

If proof is needed of the fact that the subject of union between the Presbyterian bodies is in the air, it may be found in the recent formation of an association, the basis of which is laid down in the following resolution:—"That in view of forming a representative committee, the meeting resolves as follows:—They recall with satisfaction that many unions of divided Presbyterianism have already taken place in Scotland and throughout the world; they believe the time has arrived in Scotland when the Presbyterian churches should be no longer separate; and while they recognise that there are difficulties in the way of such a general union, they believe that these are not insuperable, and that it is the duty of all Scotsmen earnestly to consider whether some solution of the question cannot be found without delay."

Since the passing of this resolution a representative committee of twenty-one members has been formed, seven prominent and influential ministers and laymen having been selected from each of the three chief Presbyterian bodies. This is significant and encouraging, but no definite scheme for attaining the object in view has been as yet formulated. It is no doubt felt that time must be allowed for full consideration and discussion of the problem; but unfortunately it may probably happen that the time will be limited by coming events, and therefore if anything is to be done it ought to be done quickly. Nothing, of course, can be gained by ignoring or minimising the difficulties referred to in the resolution quoted above. The most prominent may conveniently be stated according to the various standpoints of the three chief Presbyterian Churches.

Thus in the case of the United Presbyterian, the voluntary principle to which that body adheres appears at first sight to be in itself sufficient to form a complete barrier to any coalition without an antecedent measure of disestablishment and disendowment. With regard to the Free Church, the obstacles are not so apparent on the surface, but they are nevertheless of a sufficiently penetrating sort. In the first place, the Free Church is now to a large extent in favour of the voluntary principle. A tendency in this direction appears, indeed, to be inevitable in the case of non-established churches, even though at the time of separation from the parent body no such doctrine may have been countenanced by them. In the second place, a considerable section of the Free Church, and especially its ablest leaders, regard themselves as pledged to act, in this matter of union, with the United Presbyterian, in consequence mainly of the negotiations for an amalgamation of the two Churches which took place some years ago. The scheme was opposed by the party led by the late Dr. Begg and others, as a scheme for "union on a narrow basis," and it fell through. In the course of the proceedings, however, assurances had been exchanged between the United Presbyterians and the leaders of the Free Church who were in favour of the compact, which are regarded as honourably binding.

With regard to the Church of Scotland, it is obvious that the maintenance in a literal sense of the principle of a State Church is in itself a formidable obstacle to any close alliance with those who do not accept that doctrine. In addition to this, it is natural than an Established Church, regarding herself as in a manner the parent of the other denominations, should feel that all that is required of her is to adopt the attitude of readiness to receive those who are willing to come within her fold, without being called upon to offer inducements or make concessions. Further, it is only in accordance with human nature that the so-called disestablishment crusade, which has been carried on for some years, followed by the recent

introduction of a Bill with that object in the House of Commons, should have created in the Established Church a feeling not favourable to a brotherly understanding with those who, either actively or passively, are concerned in the hostile movement.

Such being in outline a few of the leading obstacles to a good understanding between the parties concerned, it may well be asked whether, with all this in view, the attainment of union is a thing which can reasonably be aimed at and hoped for.

May I be permitted to point out in reply to such a question that notwithstanding all the unfavourable influences which have been mentioned, a plan may be devised which, given a sincere DESIRE on the part of the respective bodies to effect a union, and a readiness on the part of each to make at least some sort of concession, would result in the formation of a combined and really national Presbyterian Church in Scotland. Thus, for example, the various bodies might agree to make a joint representation to Parliament with the view of obtaining a transfer of the Scottish ecclesiastical endowments to a new united Church, formed of existing denominations combined, the present form of connection between Church and State in Scotland to be at the same time brought to a termination. Parliament would in the first instance, of course, be asked to give merely a conditional assent to such a proposition, dependent upon the subsequent formation of the proposed coalition, and only after the fulfilment of that condition as a preliminary would the necessary legislative enactment be carried. It may be suggested as an objection to such a scheme that Parliament would not consent to it. But why not? Parliament has shown a considerable disposition to allow Scotchmen to manage their own affairs in their own way; and the fact of such a joint representation would be regarded as a significant testimony to the widespread opinion supporting it, especially as it may be assumed that the same opinion would find representation in most of the Scotch members.

No doubt a section of the House of Commons would oppose all legislation which implied any sort of recognition of religion by the State, but on the other hand the suggested mode of dealing with the question would find support from many who sit on opposite sides of the House. Besides, although it is very easy to utter a demand for disestablishment and disendowment, it is certain, as illustrated in the case of the Irish Church, that the operation is of a most difficult and delicate character.

But it may be urged that even if the attempt to form this united Church were successful, it would not be regarded with favour by the general public. While the public might be jealous of anything calculated to give undue influence to ecclesiasticism, it must be remembered that the various elements of which the united Church would be composed would furnish a sort of guarantee against

the unfavourable tendencies which are associated with that expression. Moreover, I may perhaps remind the English reader that the basis and constitution of Scotch Presbyterianism is essentially popular, and that the lay element is largely and influentially represented in the General Assembly, which is a Church Parliament dealing finally with the affairs it is called upon to consider; the scope and the effect of its proceedings being entirely different from those of Convocation, with which it has sometimes been compared.

The above observations apply also to the safeguards such a Church would possess against a spirit of intolerance, which some people apprehend would be fostered in so strong a body. It is well known that many thoughtful men regard a State Church as desirable, especially on account of the opportunity it is supposed to afford for the existence of considerable diversities of doctrine within its pale, as compared with non-established Churches, which are represented as enjoying less freedom and independence in that respect. This comprehensiveness is precisely one of the features that may be looked for in the suggested Scottish Church. Though not a State Church in the technical sense of the term, it would be thoroughly national; and though not established by law, it would be founded on the broad and firm basis of the people's approval, and having been brought into existence by the exercise of forbearance and mutual concession, it is not unreasonable to expect that these qualities would be maintained in healthy operation.

Such a Church would, in fact, perhaps provide scope for a reasonable amount of diversity of practice and order in matters where some freedom is desirable, more conveniently than in the case even of the Church of England. The traces of the compromise, of which the present order and formularies of the English Church are the outcome, remain permanent and visible. In a sense, therefore, the trumpet gives an uncertain sound; and thus, while the members of one important section of thought and feeling, though thoroughly loyal to the Church of England, have to accept or evade a good deal that is somewhat distasteful to them in the rubrics and some other portions of the Book of Common Prayer, another party, adhering more strictly to the order and rules of the Church, are disposed at heart to regard the thirty-nine Articles as the "forty stripes save one." The disadvantage of this condition of things is that either party can with some plausibility describe the other as wanting in faithfulness and obedience to the Church's doctrine and order. It is to be observed, however, that in the Church of England, as elsewhere, there has been, during recent years, a large decrease of such recriminations. The truth is, and it seems to be increasingly recognised, that in every Church the diversity of men's mental constitution, tastes, and associations will produce, speaking generally, at least three main currents of thought and feeling. The

extent to which these will be severally distinguishable may of course vary according to circumstances, but there is no reason why each and all should not co-exist in one Church united by a loyal adherence to certain central truths and obligations, and by the exercise of a charity combined with earnestness, such as will maintain an harmonious activity, totally different from the hollow and delusive peace which may be created by apathy and indifference.

The growth of mutual toleration in ecclesiastical matters in Scotland is the more notable because in no country has the process of "splitting off" been more freely resorted to in past times. The fondness for theological argument which is supposed to characterize the Scotch has probably fostered the practice. An Edinburgh minister used, to relate that on one occasion happening to visit an inhabitant of his parish, he asked what church he was in the habit of attending. The man replied that he had belonged to a certain congregation, but that he and others could not assent to certain views which were accepted by the majority, and they had therefore formed a secession. "Then you worship with those friends?" "Well, no; the fact is, I found there were certain points on which I could not conform, so I seceded." "Oh, then, I suppose you and your wife engage in devotion together at home?" "Well, not precisely. Our views are not quite in accord; so she worships in that corner of the room and I in this."

No reasonable person will confound such a *reductio ad absurdum* with the consideration of the causes of any of the serious ecclesiastical separations which have from time to time occurred in Scotland; but it should be observed, that for a considerable period no secession of any consequence has occurred in the case of any of the chief Presbyterian bodies, although there have not been wanting occasions of much difference of opinion, especially in connection with so-called heresy cases. These occasions, however, after full discussion, have been allowed to pass without any rupture, a further proof being thus afforded of the growth of Christian toleration.

With regard to the actual working out of the scheme, there are, no doubt, practical difficulties to be faced. In particular, it may be suggested that in any rearrangement as to endowments, other religious bodies than those comprehended in the proposed union ought to be recognised. No doubt if the object in view were to effect an absolute dispersion of the endowments, such claims would have to be met; but while Presbyterianism is the form of religion adhered to by an overwhelming majority of the people, it may fairly be treated as the guardian and trustee of the ecclesiastical revenues; and, moreover, there is no reason why, under the new arrangement, the application of these funds should not be, to a large extent, entrusted to the ratepayers of each parish, thus giving a voice in the

management of these revenues to the inhabitants of the districts from whence they are derived.

Having now alluded to some of the general criticisms to which such a scheme may be subjected, let us proceed to consider in what light the respective Churches might contemplate a plan, not necessarily on precisely the lines indicated, but in the same direction. Taking, as before, the United Presbyterians first, it may be said that they would gain much that they desire to accomplish, for while conceding a portion of what may be called the secular part of their programme, they would, by throwing themselves into the proposed union, confirm and energise that national Presbyterianism of which they are devoted adherents, instead of subjecting it to the rude shock which would result from mere disestablishment. No doubt the United Presbyterians have, as a body, professed and promulgated the doctrine of entire removal of State action in connection with religion. But it has not always been thought necessary to carry this doctrine to its extreme logical conclusion. Thus, in relation to education, the United Presbyterians, on the passing of the Act of 1872, did not consider it obligatory on them to oppose the teaching of Scripture in the Board Schools, although, strictly speaking, such instruction by a teacher supported by the rates would not be in accord with the voluntary principle. The fact is, the United Presbyterians, though as a rule holding decided political views, are ready to subordinate these when, in their opinion, the higher claims of religion would thereby be consulted; and surely it may be urged that the accomplishment of a fusion, in place of the present divided state of the Scottish Churches, would eminently promote the religious interests of the country.

Turning now to the Free Church, it should be observed that many of the members of that Church who have advocated disestablishment have done so from a belief that the peace and co-operation which they earnestly desire to see can in no other way be attained. At the present time, however, the tokens of an increasing disposition to a *rapprochement* may well induce them to pause and devote their attention to any feasible method of accomplishing the wished-for object in a more excellent way. Disestablishment is after all an Alexandrian mode of unravelling the Gordian knot. A scheme for effecting a reconciliation and reconstruction of the divided forces affords wider and nobler scope for statesmanship. And such a scheme, if carried out, would secure that upon which the Free Church has always laid peculiar stress. The body so constituted would be free from legislative interference or control in all purely ecclesiastical matters, while it would possess the essential elements of a truly national Church. Moreover the Free Church, which has always zealously endeavoured to maintain evangelical truth, should consider the stimulus which

would be imparted to spiritual life throughout the country as the outcome and effect of the proposed act of reconciliation.

Lastly, and especially, the Established Church of Scotland has a magnificent opportunity of enabling the desired union and concentration to be effected.

The principle of a national recognition of religion is one which thousands of Established Churchmen support with the earnestness of deep conviction. But surely the fact rather than the form ought to occupy the first place. If the application of this principle is to be always limited to the particular mode of operation with which it is usually identified, its supporters would, if logically consistent, be bound to approve of its maintenance, even when the connection between Church and State might be of a merely mechanical description, as in the case of a country where only a fraction of the population professed adherence to the State Church. With reference also to another point upon which Established Churchmen feel strongly—the reservation of the endowments to religious purposes—this would in the main be effected by the carrying out of some such scheme as that which has been indicated. The act of the legislature by which such an arrangement would be sanctioned would in itself imply a sort of permanent recognition of the claims of the Church, which would be grateful to many without necessarily offending others. Besides, it is quite certain that many in Scotland who are opposed to the maintenance of a State Church would entirely approve of such public recognition of religion as is involved in the appointment and maintenance of army and prison-chaplains, &c.

“But,” it may be asked by members of the Established Church, “why should we depart from our present position? We are a strong and growing Church, we are doing our work, we are providing ministrations for the poor. Why should we stop to negotiate with other bodies? Let us stand to our guns, whatever may be the result.” This, however, is not the highest kind of reasoning. We are not entitled to incur the responsibility of ignoring any opportunity of effecting a beneficial union, even at the cost of some apparent sacrifice. The National Church should regard the whole question from a national and not from a denominational point of view; it should estimate the benefit to the country which would be gained by union, and consider whether it is not worth some effort and even some sacrifice. It is admitted that past secessions might safely have been arrested by the exercise of timely concession, and now when the question is one not of separating but of uniting, there is once more an opportunity for magnanimous and effective action. But it may be said that ample time is required for any such operation, and that the favourable influences must be exerted gradually.

This may be true in the abstract, but we have to face the actual circumstances in which we stand. A general election is at hand, and there is no reason to believe that a majority of the new Scottish representatives will be pledged to support the Established Church. The only way in which this could be effected would be through a combination on the part of Liberal and Conservative Churchmen in every district to support only the candidate who would vote against disestablishment. But political feeling runs high in Scotland, and there is no prospect of such an alliance being systematically adopted. It will thus happen that even though a majority of the Scottish electors are not in favour of disestablishment, a majority of their elected representatives will be pledged to support such a measure, owing to the manner in which it will be thrust upon the Liberal programme during the contest. The general election will thus fail to furnish a real test of the actual feeling of the country, though the apparent result will be such as to enable a measure for disestablishment to be carried. And the effect of such a measure will not be to produce the peace and facilities for union which many hope for as a rapid result. The Established Church will die hard, and there will be prolonged bitterness and estrangement between its adherents and those of the other bodies, who will be regarded as the cause of its overthrow.

With all this in view, surely an earnest and self-denying effort ought now to be made by all concerned to effect a settlement through which, by the surrender of various non-essential points on the part of each Church, a noble work will be achieved and the best interests of the country promoted.

The difficulties are admittedly considerable. Like dark rocks at low water they loom out conspicuous; but rather than attempting to shatter these by any violent process, will it not be better to give free course to the rising tide of brotherly feeling by which all such obstructions would be submerged?

ABERDEEN.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE shadow of war, which has long rested fitfully upon Asia and Eastern Europe, has now fallen athwart England, and the net result of the past month is that our relations both with Russia and France are undergoing a strain more critical than has been the case for years. As we write Mr. Gladstone is asking the House of Commons for the war credit of which he gave notice last week, of eleven millions. The objects for which this is required sufficiently explain the policy of the Government. Four millions and a half are to defray the expenses of the military operations and the railway works in Soudan. There is to be no early advance; there will, in fact, it may be predicted, be no advance at all on Khartoum, and the English forces in the Soudan will be concentrated upon three points: the Red Sea littoral, Sinkat, as the key to the interior, and Wady Halfa, as commanding the Nile. The army of the Soudan, strengthened by reinforcements from England, as well as by other reinforcements demanded by Lord Dufferin, will form a reserve for India. India, that is to say, is to have an entire *corps d'armée* set apart for it, at a cost of half a million for its transport thither. The other six millions are to be spent on the military and naval preparations which the action of Russia in Asia and elsewhere renders necessary.

Before we offer any remarks on the prospects of peace or war as between Russia and England, it may be well briefly to summarise the events which have occurred during the last few weeks. London was profoundly moved on the morning of the 9th inst. by an ambiguous telegram from St. Petersburg, in the *Standard*, announcing a collision between the Russian and Afghan forces in the neighbourhood of Penj-deh. The intelligence was speedily confirmed by a meagre notification which the Government received from Sir Peter Lumsden, and it became known that on the 30th of March General Komaroff had attacked an Afghan force of some 4,000 men entrenched on the Kushk. The Afghans appear to have fought with desperate bravery, but their muskets could do nothing against the Russian breech-loaders, and they were driven off with the loss of their camp and about 900 men. The beginning of the engagement had been witnessed by Captain Yate, of the English Boundary Commission, who had been deputed to advise the Afghan commander. Mr. Gladstone concisely recited the intelligence in the House of Commons, stating that the Russian action, as far as the facts were known, appeared to the Government "an unprovoked aggression." For the moment it was believed that the shot destined to precipitate

hostilities between the two Great Powers had been fired; the excitement in the City approached a panic, consols falling 2½, and was communicated to the foreign bourses. M. de Giers, however, promptly begged her Majesty's Government not to allow "this regrettable incident" to mar the progress of negotiations, and published an explanatory dispatch from General Komaroff, in which that officer justified himself. The Ministry accordingly determined to await Sir P. Lumsden's observation on the Russian statement before committing themselves to an irrevocable judgment on the matter. General Komaroff, in brief, alleged that the action had been brought on by the menacing conduct of the Afghans, who had advanced towards the Russian camp, that to attack them was a necessary measure of self-defence, and that he could claim in no common degree the merit of moderation for having fallen back to his original position after the victory.

The delay involved by the resolution of the Government, although war preparations have been steadily maintained, contributed to allay the public excitement, and before long optimistic views again began to prevail. General Komaroff's allegations were not without effect both upon continental and English opinion, and the magnitude of the interests, favourable to peace at home and abroad, grew apparent. This impression was deepened by the somewhat perplexing intelligence that arrived from Afghanistan. The Ameer, to whom the news of the Penj-deh fight had been communicated while at Rawal Pindi, declared that he did not lay any stress upon the retention of Penj-deh itself, and would be satisfied with a boundary running through Zulfikar, Akrobat and Marutchak, approximately on, that is to say, the lines proposed by M. Lessar. More significant still was his assurance that the advance of English troops into Afghanistan would provoke a rising of the clans, and his inability to guarantee even the safety of an engineer officer who, it was proposed, should report upon the defences of Herat. The picture of a strong, united and friendly Afghanistan rapidly melted away in the light of these intimations. The disposition of the Afghans made it clear that their country could scarcely serve as a base of operations against the Russians, and that its real function was to exist rather as a *chevaux de frise* than as an ally between India and the northern advance. England had drifted into an awkward position, largely owing to the superior knowledge of frontier affairs which has been at the disposal of Russia at every step of the negotiations, and the greater dexterity of her officers. The abandonment of the Ameer's claim to Penj-deh opened the door for a compromise, and preliminary arrangements with regard to the new boundary began to be discussed. The one doubtful feature in the situation, however, remained—the collision at Penj-deh, about which the Government were bound by their treaty-

obligations to the *Amoer* and by the national honour to demand explanations.

As the time approached for the arrival of Sir P. Lumsden's detailed comments, symptoms were discernible that the renewed confidence in a peaceful solution was giving way. Discrepancies were discovered in General Komaroff's dispatch, and a variety of suspicious circumstances induced the belief that he had not acted without the orders of his immediate superior, Prince Dondoukoff-Korsakoff, and the cognizance of the St. Petersburg authorities. Moreover, the military party at St. Petersburg was stimulated to renewed activity by the apparent willingness of Mr. Gladstone to recognise the occupation of Penj-deh in the same spirit in which he had allowed his first peremptory demand for withdrawal "to lapse." The reported intentions of Germany and Austria to force Turkey to keep the Dardanelles closed in case of hostilities; the disagreement of England and France in Egypt were further encouragements, and the cession to this country of the valuable coaling station of Port Hamilton, off Corea, an important basis for naval operations in the North Pacific, was construed as an act of hostility. On all sides it had become apparent that M. de Gier's hand was being forced, and that the Czar could no longer oppose his peaceful inclinations to the forward school. A marked alteration has come over the tone of the Russian Press, every article in which practically passes under the official censorship. M. Katkoff's organ has vapoured about Lord Dufferin's attitude in itself constituting a *casus belli*. It is not obscurely hinted that the affair at Penj-deh was a natural retaliation for the success of the Durbar, and that Herat itself is destined soon to fall under Russian influence. Concurrently with this the St. Petersburg Foreign Office has assumed a more imperious tone, Sir Peter Lumsden's expected dispatch arrived on the 21st; it directly traversed General Komaroff's more important statements, and has left no doubt that the Russians deliberately forced on an engagement on the Kushk. The English request for a disavowal of General Komaroff has met with a blank refusal, and with recriminations directed against the English officers; finally difficulties have cropped up with regard to the boundary. If, of course, an understanding can be arrived at about the Penj-deh incident, there is no reason why these should not be evaded. But at present Russia is obviously determined to exact the uttermost she can from our embarrassments, and to allow the English Cabinet no escape from its *impasse*.

Nothing is more noticeable than the calmness of the public mind in England amid these transactions. The excitement they have occasioned has been confined to the sellers and purchasers of the special editions of the evening, and Sunday, newspapers in the streets. One of the reasons for this tranquillity is a certain perplexity

as to the points now at issue between Russia and England, the precise purpose of any conflict which may be waged, and, above all things, the limits of the area it may cover. That Russia is, in a way, menacing our Indian Empire is understood. Equally well is it understood that between the Russian outposts and the Anglo-Indian frontier there extends a vast tract of territory, inhabited by a warlike and savage race, whose ruler—as his subjects—desires to be as much as possible independent both of Russia and England. When war between England and her Asiatic rival in the neighbourhood of our own Indian dominions is talked about as imminent, it is completely forgotten that the military forces of the two are not within fighting distance of each other. Afghanistan might proclaim war on Russia with the certainty that the battle would begin at once. But if England is to try conclusions with Russia in Penj-deh, she must first entirely change her relations with the Ameer, and Afghanistan must be assimilated to the conditions of a native protected State. Failing this, the troops of England must violently overrun the province of the Ameer as a preliminary to arriving at close quarters with the troops of the Czar. The Afghans are now our allies. They receive from us a subsidy which, as a consequence of the recent interviews between Lord Dufferin and Abdur-Rahman, will, it is believed, be increased; and they are willing to profit from the skill and experience of English officers. But they decline to admit English troops to their territory. They insist, that is, upon preserving their national, and above all, their military idiosyncrasies.

Theoretically, it might be feasible to march an army through Afghanistan to Penj-deh. But the indispensable condition of this would be that military understanding with the Afghans which, as has been already explained, appears out of the question. And supposing we were to commence a military movement, with the approval of the Afghans, in this direction, what would and what might happen? The Russians would instantaneously advance upon Herat. They might win other considerable successes, and, by the time that the British soldiers closed with them, their prestige in Afghanistan might be irresistible. Only imagine the difficulty, and the peril, of our military position then! With traditional treachery, the Afghans, in the presence of the triumphant Muscovites, might turn against us, and cut off the line of our retirement to India. The utmost we could hope would be that, after having spent countless lives and untold treasure, we might be able to hold a scientific frontier, behind which our empire in Hindostan would be impregnable. And what should we have gained? Absolutely nothing. No one to-day seriously asserts that it can be worth while for us to go to war with Russia for the sake of such a strip of territory as Penj-deh. The simple problem which demands solution is how we can best guarantee India against Russian

attack, consistently with maintaining the good-will of the frontier tribes. If, what is called, the Russian advance is continued we shall, indeed, be compelled to check it with all the resources of our empire. Probably it will be our duty to come to an arrangement with China. Whatever can be done to render Russia impotent for the ends of Indian invasion,—for threatening the scientific frontier, which we have resolved shall be inviolable,—must be done. The Central Asian question has now been reopened by events in a way which does not admit of its being closed save upon conditions that shall prevent its ever being reopened again. It is no part of our business to protect the Government against the charge of apathy and remissness. Apathy, however, cannot be imputed to them in their refusal to proclaim a war against Russia in Central Asia, and upon the issue now before us. What the country desires to know is where, and why, it is going to pit itself in arms against the commanders of the Czar, and what it may hope to gain from such a contest. To this there is an obvious answer. It being confessedly absurd to go to war with Russia for her raids on what doubtless is Afghan territory, let us give her clearly to understand that we will go to war with her for any semblance of aggression on English territory. Let us establish and define a zone which, whether it be called neutral or not, is in effect English, and any trespass on which pledges England to defend it by arms. It may be that if our Government intimate to Russia that this is their policy, M. de Giers will find himself compelled to return a *non possumus* by way of reply. Then indeed it is difficult to see how war can be avoided. Only let it be understood that there can be no immediate question of war, that we are perfectly willing to forget the Penj-deh incident, that when we do fight Russia it will be for the sake of India, that once having given her battle we shall neither make, nor connive at, any attempt to localise the struggle, and that we shall not only exhaust our own strength but enlist the strength of Europe so far as we can against her.

It may be at once admitted that the answer which Russia will return to what may be the practical ultimatum of England is to say the least doubtful. The considerations which make for war in Russia are more complex and far-reaching than is generally supposed. In the first place there is the Muscovite faction,—the privileged classes who inhabit or are intimately connected with the Grand Duchy of Muscovy, the quintessence of the military aristocracy of the empire, to whom war is what fox hunting is to an English country gentleman. The autocracy of the Czar as the head of a vast nationality of soldiers, is absolutely essential to the position which the Muscovites, properly so-called, enjoy. Once impair his prerogatives and Muscovite prestige would be at an end. On the other hand the more cool-headed and decorous enemies of the Muscovites have,

for a very different reason, an interest in desiring war also. It is not true to say that every one in the Russian empire who is not a soldier is a Nihilist. This rough method of unscientific dichotomy ignores the existence of the Liberals of Russia, who are anxious that the despotism of the Czar should be replaced, not, as the Nihilists would like, by a general reduction of the body politic to chaos, but by a system, however crude, of representative Government. Now in time of peace these Liberals have no chance. It is only in time of war, and especially at the critical moment when the Russian mind, always liable to the reaction from intense elation to despair, is agitated,—if not by defeat yet by checks and reverses which go perilously close to defeat,—that Russian Liberalism has a chance of making its voice felt. Something of this sort occurred during the Russo-Turkish war, and when the Russian troops were being daily decimated in their attempts upon Plevna the late Czar felt the necessity of conceding constitutional reforms. But the hour of victory arrived, nothing more was heard of them, the autocracy of the Imperial *entourage* remained as high-handed and severe as ever, and the Liberals, determined not to stain their hands by allying themselves with Nihilism and assassinations, were once more paralysed. Bitter experience has taught these men that they can only hope for political reforms when the chief centres of Russian population, especially in the Grand Duchy of Muscovy, are depleted of the representatives of that military caste to which *ex hypothesi* war is the chief object of existence. Of this caste M. Katkoff is one of the most fiery exponents, and for the reasons now enumerated it comes to pass that he may unintentionally interpret at the same time the wishes of those whom he and his clients are so supremely desirous to trample under foot, viz., the Russian Liberals. The former look upon war as an end in itself, the latter upon war as an indispensable instrument of political reform.

It will have been observed that M. Katkoff, in his organ, has recently advocated considerable concessions to Germany with the object of securing the alliance, or at least the benevolent neutrality, of Russia's most puissant neighbour. He has even suggested that Warsaw and the left bank of the Vistula should be presented to Germany as a gift. There is good reason to believe that Prince Bismarck will not see his way, for two reasons, to accept the offer. In the first place it may be well to point out that it is from the point of view of the Muscovite faction, one which would benefit the givers more than the recipients. In the immediate neighbourhood of Moscow the distress from which Russian trades and manufactures are suffering is appallingly severe. The business they have engaged in is not adapted to their capacities. They are beaten at every turn by their German rivals who are now flourishing on Russian soil in and about Warsaw. The main secret of the pro-

perity of these is that they have escaped the high prohibitive tariffs of Germany. If they were to become subjects of the German Empire these tariffs would practically destroy the commerce which they now carry on, without let or hindrance, and at such advantage to themselves. The Muscovite merchants would gain what the German merchants of Warsaw had lost. Prince Bismarck is well aware of this, and will not accept a present from Russia, merely that his own countrymen now happily engaged in the Russian trade might suffer and their profits go to the Russian merchants in Muscovy. The second reason which renders it unlikely the arrangement advocated by M. Katkoff will ever be carried out is the general relations existing between the two countries. We in England are not sufficiently aware that the one dominating sentiment of the Russian mind is hatred of Germany, and the feeling is reciprocated by the Germans with tolerable cordiality. The result cannot in the long run be doubtful. If, to speak plainly, anything in the future is certain, it is the outbreak of war between Germany and Russia in a very few years. That being the case it ought to be an object of English policy to avert for the moment a rupture with Russia. Granted, as we have already done, that Russia is in Asia our natural enemy and that we may be compelled to fight her, surely it is to our advantage to leave, as far as may be, the responsibility for war to a power so well able to discharge it as Germany. Upon every ground of statesmanship therefore the longer we can defer hostilities with Russia the better, while, as it will now have been made plain, hostilities with Russia for the sake of Penj-doh, or for that matter unless circumstances should undergo a complete change, for Afghanistan, is an absurdity. Consequently we hold that while England may almost at any moment find herself at war with Russia, the struggle cannot be for the issues and cannot be conducted in the manner which those who talk about it idly and ignorantly imagine.

To suppose that there is not just now a desire on the part of France to lean towards Russia, even to establish with her an *entente cordiale* which may be prejudicial to England, would be to ignore self-evident facts. We may feel confident that France is desirous equally on her own account and for the sake of gratifying Russia to cause us the utmost amount of embarrassment in Egypt. The latest proof of this is the case of the *Bosphore Egyptien*. It is much to be regretted that the conduct of England in this matter has been by no means devoid of reproach. Technically, one of the provisions of the capitulations, which are in Egypt the expression and embodiment of international law, appears to have been violated by the suppression of this newspaper. The property, that is to say, of a French subject has been subjected to arbitrary damage without reference to the guardian of

French rights and interests, viz., the French consul-general or his representative. Nubar Pacha may have had some motive with which we are imperfectly acquainted in summarily prohibiting, at the request of Sir Evelyn Baring, the publication of the *Bosphore*. However that may be, the fact remains that an exceedingly high-handed and impolitic thing has been done, and a legitimate handle thus given to French complaints. We may complain as much as we like of French ingratitude. It was not, we may say, in this manner that after the insult offered by a French commander to the English flag in Madagascar we comported ourselves to the Government of the French Republic. The statement is of course true, but it has no concern whatever with the practical gravity of the affair. The French consul-general in Egypt, who happens at this moment to be in Paris, is M. Camille Barrère, an exceedingly able man and with an unquestioned ascendancy over M. Ferry's successor, M. de Freycinet. When the Ferry Government fell three weeks ago some people were bold enough to conjecture that the event would exercise an influence favourable to England. As a matter of fact the coincidence that it is M. de Freycinet who has replaced M. Ferry is of the most evil omen for the relations between France and England so far as Egypt is concerned. We have and shall continue to have in M. Camille Barrère the most astute and indefatigable underminer of our Egyptian policy. The De Freycinet Ministry is likely to last at any rate till the general elections. The extraordinary peace concluded with China after the Tonquin defeat has relieved France of one onerous responsibility, and has left her with comparative freedom and with increased desire to vex our path at Cairo. For the execution of this purpose she could have no agent more admirably qualified than M. Barrère. The question therefore may be forced upon us at any moment, how, with Russian hostility and aggression in Asia, we are to do our duty by and in Egypt? In the Imperial Parliament sitting at Westminster, substantial and satisfactory progress with Egyptian affairs has been made. The convention authorising the advance of nine millions has been accepted by the House of Commons, and the Loan Bill, the first step necessary towards giving effect to that Convention, has passed the House of Lords. Nothing could have been better than Mr. Gladstone's general vindication of both, nothing more effective or cogent than Mr. Chamberlain's speech, perhaps the greatest triumph he has ever achieved in the House of Commons, advocating the principle of the Convention and proving to demonstration we were not entering upon it without having already received tangible benefits in return. It has also been shown that this international instrument will in no way tend to compromise us in reference to the Suez Canal. Lord Randolph Churchill, who has returned to England intellectually, as well as physically improved by

his Indian trip, at once saw that Sir Richard Cross's attempt to upset the Convention by the amendment he brought forward on the motion to go into committee on the Loan Bill was a tactical blunder. Although therefore the affair of the *Bosphore Egyptien* and the relations which by way of sequel it has developed between France and England have greatly added to the difficulties and complexities of the general situation, there is nothing to find fault with in the Egyptian policy of Mr. Gladstone's Government, and the particular incident to which attention has been drawn may probably now be considered as at an end.

Such opinions as have been expressed either in the House of Commons, or by distinguished public men speaking in the country on the subject of Egypt and our relations with the Soudan, have accorded exactly with the anticipations we placed on record a month ago, and testify to the rapid growth of the conviction that it is impracticable to renew our operations against the Mahdi in the autumn. But with these few exceptions, and with the exception further of the debates on the Convention and the Loan Bill, the part filled by foreign politics, whether in parliamentary discussions or in extra parliamentary utterances, during the past three weeks, have been singularly disproportionate to the gravity of the subject. Mr. Shaw Lefevre has introduced his Bill for sixpenny telegrams, and the Seats Bill has passed through committee. Sir Charles Dilke, by the admirable tact with which he has managed this measure and by the sustained mastery of its accumulating and complicated details, has added fresh laurels to a parliamentary reputation already one of the greatest of his time. There is another circumstance of which the retrospect of the debates on the Seats Bill may remind us—that until the measure is seen actually in operation, until, that is to say, it is tested by the process of a general election, no severe party combats will be witnessed. Nothing can be more suggestive than the conditions which mark the close of the Parliament elected in 1880, in comparison with those which attended the dissolution of its predecessor. Then, and up to the very moment when Lord Beaconsfield penned his historic letter to the Duke of Marlborough, party animosities continued to wax in intensity in proportion as members and constituencies perceived that a general election was drawing near. Now, on the other hand, everything is relegated to the country. It is true that six weeks ago Ministers escaped defeat on a question of confidence by only fourteen votes. The incident has not affected in the slightest degree their position in the House of Commons. It has never been seriously urged as a justification of questions which Mr. Gladstone has deprecated as ill-advised or as inconvenient to the public service, that the circumstances of the case were exceptional, and that the result of the Vote of Censure debate early in March showed that the Cabinet was not genuinely trusted by Parliament. The tone of the Opposition

has in fact of late been altogether unexceptionable. Lord Randolph Churchill's interpellations have been dignified and statesmanlike; even Mr. Ashmead Bartlett has exhibited a certain reasonableness in his importunities. Some vigorous party speeches have, of course, been delivered in the country against Ministers, but they have been as much the reverse of exceptionally vituperative as of novel in their accusations. Within the last few days Lord Salisbury has harangued crowded audiences in Wales. But the most violent sentiment which he has shaped forth in language has been that all infidels are Liberals. The general moderation of the Tory orators may, perhaps, be easily explained. Lord Salisbury and his colleagues are probably by this time aware that there exists in the country nothing in the nature of strong feeling against Ministers, and that when the general election comes it may be necessary for the Conservatives, since they have signally failed to elaborate or propose any substitute for the policy of Liberalism, however glaring the defects of that policy may be, to point to the circumstance that recently, at any rate, they have abstained from arraigning their opponents in too unmeasured terms. The electoral campaign has, in fact, commenced already. It has come in as March proverbially goes out, like a lamb. Possibly as it proceeds it will display the temper of the lion. Meanwhile, an examination of the tactics of the Opposition may reasonably generate a belief that they are, for the moment, uncertain of their ground, or that they are, in familiar phraseology, waiting to see how the cat will jump. As to the issue of the coming struggle between parties, it would be vain to speculate. Two general observations of a very vague and therefore, safe prophetic character may be ventured upon—first, that so far as the Government are concerned, much will depend upon the course of events abroad during the interval which must elapse during now and mid-November next; secondly, that the Conservative chances will be maximised or minimised according as the members of the party pull or do not pull together, which is, perhaps, but an indirect way of saying, according as Lord Salisbury recognises in Lord Randolph Churchill his most capable lieutenant.

The premonitory echoes of the resistance which the Irish members will raise to the renewal of the Crimes Act have been of late clearly audible in the House of Commons, and on Friday last the Home Rulers, by an alliance with the Conservatives, succeeded in placing the Government in a minority on an entirely trivial matter. As regards the future, we may assume that when Mr. Parnell and his friends have made the protestations which they deem essential to their position to such legislation as Lord Spencer requires, their opposition will collapse, and that the Bill will finally pass with a tranquillity in exact proportion to the noisy clamour with which its introduction was proposed and denounced. The Irish separatists at

Westminster have not too good reason to be satisfied with the reception of the Prince and Princess of Wales on the other side of St. George's Channel. Politically the permanent results of their Royal Highnesses' visits are not likely to be very serious. "It may be" that if either the Heir Apparent, or one of his brothers, was to purchase a house in Ireland, and to spend a portion there of every year real good would be done. But independently of the question whether such an experiment would not be made too late, difficulties are likely to be placed, by those who have the wish and the power to do so, in its way. The Prince and Princess of Wales return to London in the course of the next few days, and the retrospect, like the progress, of their journey is at least interesting. So strongly favourable to them was on the whole the popular sentiment that the few hostile demonstrations organized against their Royal Highnesses have failed conspicuously. In the South of Ireland disagreeable collisions have taken place between the police and the Parnellites. The demonstrations in Tralee, Listowell and Limerick have been upon the feeblest and puniest scale. If the Prince of Wales has not contributed to the solution of the real Irish difficulty, he has at least proved that he can trust to an Irish multitude to receive him as cordially as a London crowd. His visit has not been, what indeed nobody ever expected it would be, a political victory. But it has proved a personal and social triumph of a peculiarly gratifying kind, marked at every stage by amenities which, if they do not accomplish much good, do no harm, and which are agreeable and creditable to all concerned in them.

The prospect of a war with Russia has turned the eyes of Englishmen with more than ordinary interest to our colonies and foreign settlements. Ministers, reminded of the duties of defence, are scanning the farthest boundaries of our empire with anxious gaze, are equipping war vessels, buying torpedoes, and securing fast merchantmen from every well-known line. The realities of a naval conflict have been at length realised, and it is beginning to be understood how evil the case of England might be were her ocean routes interrupted, her trade dislocated, and her empire exposed to the ravages of an enemy's cruisers. The dependence of England upon her empire, the identity of interests which exists between her and every distant settlement which owes her allegiance, is illustrated and emphasized both in Parliament and upon every public platform. And all this apprehension and haste have arisen from the mere risk of danger at the hands of a third-rate naval power! We have talked much of late about the potential greatness of our colonial empire, but the first breath of war lays its weakness bare. The remedy for this weakness, it is consoling to feel, rests with ourselves. We must build, fortify, and consolidate. It is perceived that Russia has the choice of many objectives, and that the scene of her exploits may be

laid in many a distant corner of the world. A maritime conflict could not be localised and the only plan is to meet cruiser with cruiser and to hold as many coaling stations and forts in distant seas as possible. Certainly the activity in our dockyards and arsenals is remarkable, and to some extent spasmodic. The danger is that, if the Russian scare passes away, a relapse may come. Let England take the lesson to heart and meditate upon it. We are now almost for the first time in our history beginning to realise what the cost of empire means. And the cost must be paid if the empire is to be kept.

If political meetings can accentuate political necessities, that held on April 16th at the Cannon Street Hotel on the subject of our commerce and the state of our fleet, is memorable. Mr. W. H. Smith, while drawing attention to the fact that our food supply, which is imported at the rate of £17,000,000 a year, must be protected, can hardly, in face of the facts produced, be accused of making a random statement when he observed, that in the event of war the amount of protection which we can guarantee is inadequate. Mr. Forster subsequently remarked that, should this supply, or any considerable part of it, be stopped, it is impossible to picture it as happening "without sufferings and terrible misfortune. It is our determination," he said, "that, at any cost, we will keep up our position of protecting our old island from invasion, of protecting our ships upon the sea, of protecting the colonies who show that they are our fellow-countrymen, of protecting the almost countless millions of our fellow-subjects. It is absolutely necessary to make our navy strong." This, it need not be said, is a reversion to the policy of Cobden, who maintained that England should be twice as strong as France upon the seas. But, our necessities are greater now than they were in Cobden's time, for our energies have to be devoted, not only to keeping afloat a large and sufficient fleet, but to strengthening, so as to render impregnable, various important points along our commercial routes. "From the Cape, Hong Kong, Singapore, British Columbia and elsewhere, the plaint of unpreparedness meets us. Experience teaches us daily that the best way to avoid inevitable conflicts is to build ships and erect forts, and show ourselves ready along the whole line."

The question of the comparative value of Simonstown and Table Bay as a naval port in South Africa has been raised by those who are anxious to make our position in those southern waters absolutely secure, but who are yet undecided whether our chief defences should be built by the shores of Table Bay or False Bay.

The position of Simonstown itself is bad. The place is overlooked, and dominated, by high mountain ridges which are at present unfortified, and might be occupied by a daring foe willing to run the risk of

landing secretly in one of the bays in its rear. As matters are, and supposing Simonstown is kept as the most important station, it would be necessary to add largely to its defences and fortify the adjoining hills. Naval warfare having undergone such a revolution within the last few years, it would be hazardous to trust to the ships outside as an impregnable first line of defence. It might be assumed that turret-ships would be effectual guardians of this and similar positions, if exposed simply to the chances of a conflict with fast cruisers, necessarily their inferiors in armament. We have, however, to reckon with torpedoes. It has been pointed out by a competent critic, that "one of the first measures which must be taken in hand is to establish an impregnable and large naval station at the Cape. It is essential to the security and commerce of all the Australian colonies, of India, and all our Eastern dependencies." The damage which any formidable vessel might inflict upon British trade off the Cape has been sufficiently demonstrated to induce our naval authorities to adopt the most active and vigilant precautions. In such precautions, it is not too much to ask the Cape colonists themselves to take an adequate share, when some more definite scheme of Imperial defence is formulated. The same safeguards which are so urgently needed at the Cape stations are equally needed in the North and South Pacific. Any isolated and strong position outside the zone of Australian interests, strictly so called, must be taken up promptly by the Imperial Government. It is satisfactory to learn, therefore, that Port Hamilton, in the North Pacific, off the southern extremity of the Korean Peninsula, has been recently occupied by England. This port has been termed the East Asiatic Gibraltar, and is conveniently placed for offence and defence. It is distant thirty-eight miles from the island of Quelquert, and has a well-sheltered and spacious harbour, lying between three small rocky islands. The peninsula of Korea has itself been fairly free from interference at the hands of Europeans—the dissensions of which we hear occasionally being fomented by national jealousies between Chinese and Japanese. But it is rumoured that Russia regards this country as affording favourable opportunities for her intrigues; and the hoisting of the British flag at Port Hamilton will have the effect of checkmating her ambitious and aggressive designs in those seas. Moreover, the Russian port of Vladivostock, at the northern boundary of the Korean Peninsula, must in case of war be exposed to attack from this port, which commands the Korean Channel and the entrance to the Sea of Japan on the east and the Yellow Sea on the west. It is to be hoped that no diplomatic remonstrances will induce England to part with this coign of vantage.

In British Columbia, whither on a previous occasion Russian admirals were intending to direct their attention, the utmost efforts

are being made by the naval and local authorities to be on their guard. In the Australian colonies and the Pacific it is hardly necessary to remark that the vigour of the colonists is conspicuous. The wardship of the seas is a vast responsibility, but it is being met in every quarter. It is a matter of regret that a rebellion in a distant part of Canada should cripple for a moment the resources of the Dominion Government, especially when the colonists were unfeignedly anxious to proffer loyal aid to England, and contribute in a material fashion towards the defence of the Empire. Canada, however, can be trusted to take care of itself. There is direct telegraphic communication from New Westminster in Columbia to London, and the opening up of the country by railway enterprise has rendered military concentration easy.

An Anglo-Russian war would probably cause the colonies to seek a closer union with the mother country. A stern and protracted campaign always develops as it goes on some deep national or Imperial sentiment, and strengthens rather than weakens ethnical ties. Twelve millions of British colonists will feel that they in company with the parent State have been exposed to the "unprovoked aggression" of the Muscovite, and will resent it as a common injustice. England's hands are clean in the Afghan matter, and therefore no colony can feel that in the case of war they have, owing to their Imperial connection, been exposed to unnecessary risk, or sacrificed in any way to an arbitrary and Chauvinistic policy at home. It does not require an extended flight of imagination to picture the era when the Australian, South African and North American colonies will stand not only strong in themselves but be in a position, if they advance at their present rate, to make their influence and example felt amongst all other nations. If an Anglo-Russian conflict be the first historical occasion upon which Britons in various parts of the world have united together and sealed their unity with their blood, it will be a memorable and important one, and bring after it results which can scarcely fail to be satisfactory. Already the Australian contingent at Suakim has volunteered its service in Central Asia in the event of hostilities. In England the idea of the unity of the Empire, perhaps the most important and pregnant one of the future for us, continues to invite not only dispassionate criticisms of a favourable character but in some instances glowing eulogium. Sir Charles Dilke at Edinburgh and Mr. Courtney in Cornwall, expressed themselves in nearly identical language when referring to the generous conduct of New South Wales. As, however, Mr. Courtney was not very long ago Under Secretary for Colonial Affairs, it is curious that he should have fallen into the mistake of attributing a protectionist policy to New South Wales, and a free trade policy to Victoria.

The Federal Council for Australia Bill, introduced by Lord Derby

into the House of Lords last week, must excite mixed feelings. That five colonies should be willing to come together for certain purposes of mutual interest, is as gratifying as the refusal of the two most important colonies to join hands with their neighbours is disappointing. No Australasian Council can pretend to be representative or complete whilst New South Wales holds aloof. New Zealand, separated as she is by a wide strip of ocean from Australia, is not so essential to an Australasian Dominion. Not until the Federation of Australasia is complete, and a Dominion similar to that of Canada is realised, will the question of the unity of the empire be materially affected by the proposal now before Parliament. The measure, as it stands, is pregnant with hopes and fears. Once we have an Australasian Dominion we shall have arrived at a stage of empire which will mean consolidation or disintegration. Nothing can be more certain than that the permanent union of our colonies on the other side of the world, will revolutionise the relations between themselves and the mother country. A repetition of the New Guinea business will scarcely be possible, or, if possible, the result will be different. The voice of a community nearly as large as London will not be hushed as easily as Queensland was reprimanded for planting the British flag on the north of Torres Straits. Again, such a community cannot be expected to consent to remain silent on matters of Imperial moment which directly or indirectly affect its welfare. But, whilst on these points an Australasian Dominion will probably be firm, and will be loyal to England in proportion as its wishes receive adequate consideration, so it may be that they will prove the rocks on which the newly-launched barque of the Pacific will be torn asunder. Even on the New Guinea question the colonies were not entirely agreed among themselves. Clause 31 of the Federal Council Bill provides for the secession of any colony which disapproves of the action of the Chamber. To this clause will be due, if to either, the failure of the measure. Why should a colony withdraw in the event of the Council not being entirely in accord with its own views? If such a withdrawal takes place, it is to be feared that the result will be to embitter the relations between the colony and its neighbours, and to render the Council impotent to give effect to decrees which might be of the most vital and general importance.

The news from South Africa is meagre. The submarine cable has broken down again somewhere in the Mozambique Channel, and we are left without the latest telegraphic intelligence of what is going on in that part of the world. The advisability of possessing an alternative cable by the West Coast is again impressed upon us. The periodical isolation of the Cape is a matter of serious consideration, not only to merchants and ship-owners, but to the Government, who in the event of a war would be anxious to have direct communication with all their military and naval posts.

According to the latest tidings, affairs in Bechuanaland appear to be at a standstill,—a disagreement, on which the public need to be more precisely enlightened, having arisen between Sir Hercules Robinson and Sir Charles Warren. The latter is acting with characteristic vigour, and is conducting a minute investigation into the circumstances of the murder of the late Mr. Bethell. Should occasion render it necessary to demand the surrender of guilty persons from the Transvaal itself, Sir Charles Warren asks for the official word to make this demand. Here it is that a difficulty has arisen. Acting, presumably, upon the advice of Mr. Upington, the Cape Premier, the High Commissioner has interposed objections to this course, and his objections can only be justified by supposing that serious legal flaws have been found in the whole trial. On the grounds of equity, there is no reasonable doubt that Sir Charles Warren's request is perfectly justifiable. Such men as the murderers of Mr. Bethell place themselves, by their own action, beyond the pale of ordinary justice. Moreover, the law that reigns in Bechuanaland at present is martial law. The fear is that our High Commissioner, working for the sake of peace at any price—for this murder trial, strangely enough, comes to be regarded as a race question between Dutch and English, instead of a question in which the cardinal distinctions between right and wrong should be upheld—may wish to hush the whole matter up by relying upon the technicalities of the Attorney-General, Mr. Upington. If Mr. Bethell's murderers escape, the proceedings of Sir Charles Warren will have been a farce. However, as a direct appeal has been made to Lord Derby, the responsibility of decision must lie with the head of the Colonial Office. It seems a pity that Sir Charles Warren was not given a free hand, and allowed to act independently of the High Commissioner. In fact the whole Bechuanaland question would have been simplified had it been regarded as a purely Imperial concern. At a later period the country might, perhaps, have been handed over to the Cape Colony. Moreover, our Imperial responsibilities have increased rather than diminished. A British protectorate has been proclaimed over Secheli's and Khama's country up to 22° parallel, and a large tract brought under British control. The necessity of keeping a permanent British force somewhere in these regions, with posts from Kimberley to Bamangwato, would seem to have arisen. Such a force need not be of an expensive character. It might resemble the Natal police or the Cape Mounted Rifles, but might be large enough to give effect to our rule, nip disorder in the bud, and guarantee security to black and white alike. There are many objections against the present method of sending out suddenly, and under pressure of strong emergency, periodical armaments of a costly description.

ISMAIL: A VINDICATION.

THE English are a strange people: they throw themselves with eager enthusiasm into some one political question which for the time absorbs their energies, occupies their daily thoughts, fills columns of the morning papers, and forms the constant conversation of all classes. Thus it was that a few months ago Egypt and its surroundings, Wolseley, Gordon, and the Mahdi, Stewart, Wilson and Beresford, were the engrossing objects of national interest. Presently an alarm of war with a great semi-barbarous nation sounded throughout the country, and as it is impossible for England to be engrossed by two large questions at a time, Englishmen forthwith flung everything connected with Egypt and the Soudan to the winds, and centred all their pugnacity, all their faith in British right and British power in the consideration how to vindicate that right on the Afghan borderland, and how to punish Komaroff's wanton attack on our plucky allies at Pul-j-Khisti. They did not pause to inquire whether our allies asked for our vindication, whether they desired us to assist in the punishment, if punishment there was to be. They rushed at the conclusion that the preparations which the Government wisely thought it necessary to make, absolutely proved that the only way out of the difficulty was through the arbitrament of war. And now that a rift has appeared in the black cloud which hung over the political horizon, they have rushed to the opposite extreme, forgotten the dangers with which they believed themselves to be surrounded and returned to the usual current of their daily thoughts.

This being the case, they will be open to a fresh impression, or at least to the revival of an old play under a new guise. And there is no doubt that the Egyptian question is put in a novel form, when a political pretender, when a prince who aspires to sovereignty, when a son of Mehemet Ali, announces, through the medium of a magazine article, that he hopes to be promoted to the Viceroyalty of Egypt, and gives,—be it in his own language, or be it in words selected for him by an able exponent of his thoughts I know not,—the reasons and the arguments upon which he bases these hopes and

aspirations. Consequently Englishmen will now, in this moment of revulsion of feeling from the great war scare, be able to give a transitory consideration to the plea put forward by Prince Halim.

No one, I think, can help being struck with the simplicity of his ideas, with his total ignorance of modern politics and of the vast changes the last thirty years have produced; with the absence of any reference to the greatest of Mediterranean factors, the intrigues and the ambition of France, and the wire-pulling of French financiers; with the absolute submission to the Khalif and the desire to re-establish his lost authority in the regions of the Nile; with the Oriental fatalism accommodated by an astute hand to the ancient Tory faith of Great Britain. All this, too, is thinly veiled under the bitter animosity exhibited by Prince Halim in every page towards his nephew, the ex-Khedive Ismail. It may be well then to ascertain something about Prince Halim, and to examine for a moment a few of the pleas he puts forward. But before I do so I wish to observe that when I speak of France I do not so much mean the French people, as a certain set of French politicians who have of late made their influence specially felt.

And first as to Prince Halim. What is his history? What qualifications has he shown for the high post to which he aspires? He is one of the sons of Mehemet Ali, who was admittedly a man of great energy and remarkable military capacity, and who commenced the attempt to render Egypt independent of the Sultan. But Prince Halim inherited none of the ability of his father. He was only twice employed in a public capacity, and that for a very short time. In 1856 he was sent by his brother, Saïd Pasha, to the Soudan with the grand title of Governor-General, although at that time a great part of the Soudan was not under Egyptian sway. He states that he was sent at his own request, whereas the generally received impression is, that he was sent there, in fact, to be got out of the way; but, whether that be the case or not, he did nothing to show that he possessed capacity for government. In 1863 Ismail became Viceroy, and for a brief period Halim was president of his Council; but it was impossible, if report speaks true, for the new ruler to retain him long in that position, owing to the intrigues in which he embarked, and the adventurers with whom he surrounded himself. Moreover, as Prince Halim now talks of Ismail's debts, as if debt were a thing unknown to himself, he assuredly must have forgotten his own financial position, which caused him in 1865 to sell his estates to the Egyptian Government for the sum of a million sterling. Since that time he has led a mute inglorious existence at Constantinople amongst a retinue which could do no one great honour, indulging now and then in some mild intrigues, and, unlike his father, pinning his faith in the Khalif, because he hopes, perhaps, that through some lucky turn of the

wheel and the support of the Sublime Porte, he may yet have a chance of becoming ruler of Egypt. Some six months ago Halim inherited a considerable sum of money from a sister; and latterly he burst into momentary prominence, because one of the proposals made by that most charming of special envoys, Hassan Fehmi Pasha, was that the Sultan should depose Tewfik and put Halim in his place, a proposal which the English Government most properly declined even to discuss.

Such is Halim's history: and all will agree that it is not one to justify the expectation that in him is to be found a man capable of bringing order into the distracted land of Pharaoh. Moreover the statements he makes with regard to Ismail show such petty meanness, such perversion of the facts, and such a desire to ascribe every misfortune which has fallen upon Egypt to his much hated nephew, that no one could have confidence in him as a ruler of men. What are his main allegations and charges against Ismail? He states that the two ruling passions of Ismail's nature are the love of money, and the love of notoriety. He alleges that for this reason the whole debt of Egypt except five millions was incurred by Ismail, and that for this reason also the conquest of Darfour was undertaken, and the attack made on Abyssinia. He asserts that Ismail neglected all the serious duties of his office, and that his rule was a failure, as is proved he thinks by the present condition of Egypt, thus making Ismail responsible for what has occurred during the last six years. He further says that Ismail provoked the military demonstration which overthrew the international cabinet of which Wilson and Blignières were members. He adds that all that the Egyptian people wanted was justice, and for that reason they rejoiced when Ismail fell; and yet again he makes him responsible for the weakness, the errors and the disasters of Tewfik's rule. And he makes, both directly and by innuendo, other minor charges which need not be noticed here. It is sufficient to deal with the main items in the catalogue, and the best way to do this is to state in a few words the real history of Ismail's rule.

In 1863 Ismail succeeded a weak but well-meaning prince, for as Tewfik compares to Ismail, so Saïd and Halim compare to Mehemet Ali. Being a man of great energy and vigour of character, he resolved to follow in the footsteps of Mehemet Ali, and to endeavour to make Egypt free from the rule of the Porte. At the same time, his idea was to introduce European civilisation, and the many improvements which follow in its train, so as to promote the prosperity and improve the position of the country, and to do this in friendly alliance with Western Europe. Hence it was that he spent large sums on the Suez Canal (for which the Firmans containing terms eminently unfavourable and onerous to Egypt had been granted

by his predecessor), on bridges and canals, on telegraphs, railways, harbours, lighthouses, waterworks, sugar factories, and many other public requirements, which in other lands are often provided by private enterprise. The total expenditure on all these great works was over £51,000,000; but, as is clearly shown in an able pamphlet published last year by Mr. McCoan, M.P., the total net proceeds of all his loans were two millions less; and consequently it is plain that, extravagant or not, he spent all he received from loans—ay, and even much more—on the undertakings which, rightly or wrongly, he imagined to be for the benefit of the country. How was it much more? Why simply because Halim is conveniently forgetful when he says that Saïd only left a debt of five millions, for the real amount of the indebtedness which he bequeathed to Ismail in funded and floating liability was the large sum of fifteen millions of money; so that really Ismail, notwithstanding his extravagance, and notwithstanding his warlike expeditions, not only derived no personal advantage from the loans in question, but spent big sums from other sources on the objects to which the whole of these loans were devoted. But it may be said, however good in themselves, were these objects so important and so vitally necessary that it was right, in the course of fifteen years, to incur the indebtedness which these great works entailed? The answer is plain. Had Ismail been able to obtain money on fair terms it might have been well, because these works enormously increased the productive power and the income of the country. But as his money was obtained on terribly usurious conditions—as he had to use for his intermediaries men who waxed rich whilst he grew poor; men who rose in the social scale whilst he fell; men who, since his fall, have been eager to attack him for his extravagance, without which they themselves would be nowhere; men who have been foremost to kick him now that he is down, and that they expect no further benefits from him—it must be obvious that he would have been wiser to have done less, and that it would have been better for himself and for his country, though worse for many of those who are now his enemies. In fact he should have observed the motto, “*festina lente*,” and he would have been not only one of the most eager, but also one of the most successful reformers of his time. I say, therefore, his error was that he was too great, and, above all, too rapid a reformer, and it is for this that he has suffered.

Now let us consider the same question, for a moment, from a different point of view. What was the income of the country when Ismail succeeded in 1863? It was less than £4,500,000 a year. What was it in 1879, when Ismail was deposed? Something under nine millions and a half a year. This immense increase in the revenue in the course of fifteen or sixteen years cannot be ascribed alone to its normal improvement and expansiveness, but must be ascribed to the

great public works which Ismail initiated. Consequently though, as I have stated above, he was too rapid a reformer, the loans contracted by him were obviously for reproductive undertakings, reproductive even on the gross or nominal amount of his debt, viz., some £62,000,000, from which, as I have previously mentioned, the Egyptian Treasury only really obtained less than £50,000,000.

An increase of revenue amounting to £5,000,000 a year ought to have been able to provide a reasonable interest, even on an addition of £60,000,000 to the capital of the debt, and leave a handsome margin for State expenditure. But unfortunately the conditions upon which he obtained his money were far too onerous; and the loan contractors, or rather those who possessed Egyptian bonds, were too unwilling to agree to a sufficiently large reduction of interest to enable the Khedive permanently to pay his way. They demanded, in fact, a high rate of interest for their money, with, at the same time, a security as ample as that now to be offered by the loan about to be raised with the European guarantee. In short, as I have before elsewhere pointed out, they invoked the authority of the French and English Governments; and they obtained, by means of the law of liquidation and other equally unfair transactions, a kind of international recognition of the full payment of their interest, with a heavy premium on the repayment of the capital; and their action, and especially that of the French financiers, it was which created, in 1879, the political position of which I shall again have to speak directly.

In fact the substance of the argument at this point is that had Ismail towards the end of his reign been allowed to make reasonable arrangements with his creditors without the external interference of European Powers, he would have been able to pay his way, notwithstanding the usurious terms upon which his loans were issued. And I must say again that Lord Palmerston's principle, that those who lent to foreign States at high rates of interest must not expect or be allowed Government assistance for the purpose of obtaining either principal or interest, was the right one, and was never infringed until Lord Beaconsfield's Government gave way to the extraordinary demand of the French to make the Egyptian financial difficulties a cause of interference and intervention. In fact French financial magnates have for the last seven or eight years been the wire-pullers of European interference in Egypt, and the example thus offered is pregnant with evil augury for the future. But however this came about, there can be no question both that Ismail might have paid his way had a reasonable arrangement been made, and that he did all in his power to meet even the hard demands of the creditors of the State. This he proved, for to meet the difficulty in the case of the Daira loans, of which I have not hitherto spoken, he surrendered his own private estates and those of his family. Nor have we English

the right to throw a stone at his administration when we remember that, as I have shown above, at least the total amount of his borrowings was spent in public works, whereas under our control a debt of £8,000,000 or more has been accumulated during the last five or six years, and we have no public works to point to, to explain the debt, but only a disordered and devastated country. But it may be said that the revenue of nearly nine millions and a half which Ismail was able to collect was obtained by oppressive measures, and was consequently not a true index of the condition of the country. I reply that it was a true index, because notwithstanding the troubles connected with Arabi's rising, notwithstanding the evils inflicted on the country by the bombardment of Alexandria and the military operations which took place subsequently, notwithstanding the vast losses caused by the war with the Mahdi, still even now the revenue for 1885 is calculated by the English Treasury advisers at £9,000,000; and the difference between this sum and Ismail's may be readily accounted for by all these disasters. Moreover, the returns presented to Parliament give the following figures:—

	Revenue.
1881	£9,229,965
1882	8,852,857
1883	8,934,675
1884	9,365,000

figures which abundantly prove my argument.

I think then that I have shown that if the ruling passion of Ismail's nature was the love of notoriety, or rather, as I should put it, was an honourable ambition to improve the condition of his country, it was rather from overhaste and from the greed of his financial assistants than from a mistake in the inception, or from errors in the execution, of his great schemes of public improvement that he failed to obtain that success which he might reasonably have anticipated.

And this leads me to consider the assertion made by Halim that Ismail exhibited an inordinate love of money, whereas in my opinion he has shown exactly the reverse, and has exhibited a self-abnegation rare even in the loftiest and most high-minded of Western statesmen. At least I can assert that, instead of being richer he is far poorer than when he succeeded Saïd in 1863. This is easy of proof. He was then the most wealthy private person in Egypt. His estates brought him in an income of £300,000 a year, although they had not been improved as he has admittedly since improved them. All these estates, and at the same time the estates of his family, did he surrender for the benefit of the Daira creditors between 1877 and 1879 in return for the comparatively speaking moderate allowance of £200,000 a year. That allowance, it was understood, was to be guaranteed him when he was removed, as I

shall presently show, against the faith which ought to have been observed with him; but it did not continue to be paid, and at this moment I believe it is a fact that he only receives from the Egyptian Treasury £40,000 a year, and that he possesses little personal private property. Consequently it is obvious that what he has to-day compares most unfavourably with the income from his unimproved estates in 1863, and absolutely disproves the allegation that he is actuated by an inordinate love of money.

Next I will deal with the statement with regard to the subjugation of Darfour. The expedition was undertaken as the result of the instances of Western Europe, and especially of England, for the purpose of putting down the slave-trade. It was unpopular with the Egyptian people, but it was another proof of the wish Ismail had to adopt European ideas of civilisation; and we consequently have no right to allow it to be used to his discredit. It was with the same view that Gordon was employed by Ismail in the Soudan, and surely it was no small feather in Ismail's cap, no slight thing for an Egyptian, even though that Egyptian be the ruler of the country, to have obtained such a mastery over the mind and to be able to command the services of such a man as General Gordon. The last letter which has been published from Gordon, and which is addressed to Ismail, proves sufficiently his great personal devotion to the ex-Khedive; and consequently I say that here again Halim's charge is completely disproved. I agree with Prince Halim that the expedition against Abyssinia was a mistake; but it had no serious consequences, and was a mistake such as many rulers, even of constitutional countries, have to plead guilty to.

It is needless seriously to consider the assertion that Ismail neglected the duties of his position; all who have been in Egypt are aware that in his eager desire for work and attention to the details of the different departments of the public service, he might fairly, in his sphere, be entered as a rival to our own energetic Prime Minister; and consequently I pass to a refutation of the statement that Ismail provoked the military demonstration which overthrew the international cabinet, of which Sir Rivers Wilson and M. de Blignières were members. The real fact was that those gentlemen had recommended a réduction in the army which involved the dismissal of something like four thousand officers, to whom were owing considerable arrears of pay, in consequence of which at the time of their dismissal they were living more or less on credit. It is well known that the Khedive and other authorities pointed out that it would be unfair to dismiss these men unless their arrears were paid. The Ministry, however, in their anxiety to reduce expenditure, determined on this step. The result was that the credit of these officers was stopped, they and their families were left more or less to starva-

tion, and hence, not unnaturally, they made the demonstration in question. And to show that they were wise in their generation it is only necessary to add that their arrears were paid some twenty-four hours afterwards. It is a matter of regret, therefore, that the Ministry did not see their way to making this payment, somewhat earlier; in that case the demonstration would never have taken place, nor would the grave results which ultimately followed from it.

I do not propose to go further into the financial question connected with the events to which I have just referred, as I explained my views on this subject in an article I wrote last year, entitled "England and the Conference;" but it is needful to note the political aspect of the question, and especially to consider why Ismail was deposed in 1879, and why it involved as clear a breach of faith to him as can be found in political history. A large amount of the debt of Egypt had passed into French hands in the period after the close of the Franco-German War. The contractors had made their profit, and were, relatively speaking, not personally interested to any very large extent. But the public who had absorbed the loans were, as I have said, anxious to retain their high rate of interest at the same time that they obtained an international security in place of the one which they had originally accepted. The French Government was weak, and was glad to show its power by pressing the Khedive in support of the French bond-holders; and diplomatic action took place as unusual as irregular. Ismail tried various means of getting out of the difficulty; Mr. Cave was consulted, and so were, subsequently, Messrs. Goschen and Joubert. Then came the Commission of Inquiry and the International Ministry, as it is called, and then followed the dismissal of Nubar Pasha. Ismail, who had endeavoured to meet the many unreasonable demands of the French and English Governments, finding it impossible to keep pace with the ever-growing clamour of the State creditors and pressure of Western Europe, at last endeavoured to throw off the condition of subserviency to which he was reduced, but in vain. Then Lord Salisbury agreed to the extraordinary proposal of the French Government to join in the request to the Porte to depose Ismail and place Tewfik in authority instead. This was in June, 1879. Though it was a breach of contract as clear and as unjustifiable as any recorded in the pages of history, the Porte was only too glad to act upon the request, because it tended to re-establish its authority over Egypt which it had been steadily losing during the rule of Mehmet Ali, and which it had actually agreed to sacrifice during that of Ismail. I say it was a breach of faith because Ismail by increasing the tribute from £376,000 a year to £678,000, and by other heavy money payments made to the Porte, had purchased firmans which gave him the right of independent management of his territory and

the establishment of the system of direct succession, which of course did not imply that his son should succeed him against his will during his lifetime, but only after his death. To this I thought it my duty in Parliament in 1879 to call public attention. I then declared that it was the commencement of a course of action which would be disastrous in its results alike to Egypt and to England. And who can deny that it has been so? I inveighed against the dual control as a system which it would be impossible to maintain. And who can deny that it has been a ghastly failure? And the reason for all this is clear. It is that the French, who have for years been steadily working to establish a preponderating influence on the southern shores of the Mediterranean, were not in accord with us in the course of action which it was considered desirable to pursue; they looking at the financial position, and we at the political. The first false step led to many others—to the bombardment of Alexandria, and ultimately to the sacrifice entailed by again submitting ourselves to the instructions of Europe when the Conference was called last year. The Conference failed because the French financiers, who still guided the policy of France, were determined at that time that no reduction of interest, or, as it is called technically, no cutting of the coupon should take place, and that the law of liquidation, as it is improperly named, should be observed in its integrity. I cannot say that I, for one, regretted this action of theirs, as it rendered the political agreement which the English Government had provisionally, though unwillingly, made with France null and void. Again, then by the failure of the Conference we obtained some liberty of action; but France stepped in continually to thwart the measures which the Government endeavoured to adopt in place of those proposed at the Conference as a solution of the financial difficulty; and thus again French financiers have been masters of the situation, and have practically dictated the arrangement which has just been come to. To my mind any such arrangement can only serve as a temporary expedient, and not as a real remedy; for it is impossible for any ruler, even if he be one of more strength of character, and one possessing more real power than the shadow of both that Tewfik can boast of, to do anything in the sense of successful government as long as he is subjected to the unreasonable and unfair law of liquidation. Egypt should be left to do what has been allowed to other States that have contracted burdens too heavy for them, viz., make arrangements with their creditors without the interference of foreign governments. This can only be done when the law of liquidation has been abolished. It must take place at some time or other, and I say the sooner the better in the real interests of Egypt and her people, of France and of Europe. But France having accomplished the absorption of Tunis, with which she was occupied after Tel-el-Kebir,

when these steps might have been taken, France having in Tunis settled on terms of her own choosing the arrangement of the Tunisian debt, and having abolished the capitulations there, is ready to proceed on her career of Mediterranean extension, and consequently has effectually reasserted the position which she had forfeited in Egypt. Of this, if further proof were wanted, she has given proof in her action with regard to the *Bosphore Egyptien*.

Prince Halim, in his anxiety to obtain the support of the Porte to the idea of his replacing Tewfik, is subservient enough to call Egypt a portion of the Sultan's estates, and says that the difficulties with which we have had recently to deal in Egypt, have arisen from the idea that whereas France had absorbed Tunis, England had been awarded that other portion of the Sultan's estates, viz., Egypt; and to this he traces ultimately the events which have led to the war in the Soudan. I shall in a moment treat of this question, but here I want it clearly to be understood that in my opinion the financial question will never receive a real solution until both the law of liquidation and the capitulations have been abolished, and until the authority of the ruler of Egypt which we have made nominal in the person of Tewfik is made real and substantial—until, I say, that ruler is allowed to settle with his creditors, and to exercise, as in all his earlier years Ismail exercised with a strong hand, all the functions of Government.

Next we must consider for a moment the position in the Soudan and the way out of the complications in which we have been recently involved.

I stated last year that I for one regretted that owing to the urgent representation of the Conservative party the Government had given way to the proposal to allow Gordon to go to Khartoum to endeavour to extricate by peaceful means the Egyptian garrisons in the Soudan for which we were not responsible, but for which we thereby assumed a quasi responsibility. That responsibility was rendered real when Gordon's chivalrous idea failed, and he commenced active military work. The Government would have required courage to do it, but they would have been right in then recalling him; but, as they did not, they were involved in an expedition undertaken for his rescue. That expedition, though it brought into light as clearly as ever the splendid qualities of our soldiers and their leaders, yet failed of its object, and then came the decision against which many radicals rightly, I think, protested, to "Smash the Mahdi." That involved also the dispatch of an army corps to Suakim, and the attempt to construct a railway which the most experienced engineers declare, even in times of peace, could only be accomplished in two years and a half. But fortunately the course of events has shown that it is not necessary for us to smash the Mahdi; in fact he is more threatened

than threatening, and no one is perfectly clear as to his whereabouts or his following; but it is certain he no longer wields any considerable military power. Consequently, although it is true that if it is of advantage to Egypt that the Nilometer established at Khartoum by Mehemet Ali should be under Egyptian control, it is nevertheless with satisfaction that we hail the decision of the Government that this advantage is not sufficient to justify the prosecution of a further military expedition to that city; an expedition which must have involved great loss of life to English and to Arabs, and a large expenditure for which there would be no return. We are, therefore, now in a position again to examine what is to be our future relation to Egypt, and what is to be its future government, without being hampered by the burden of a great military expedition, or by the small considerations which Prince Halim endeavours to import.

Halim says that no satisfactory government can be established without the friendly countenance and support of the Khalif: and Hassan Fehmy Pasha has recently been endeavouring to re-establish Turkish influence in Egypt by inducing our Government to replace British troops in Egypt by Turkish ones. Halim's father, Mehemet Ali, would have blushed at the allegation of his son; and the whole course of history proves the undesirability of again allowing active Turkish interference in Egypt. But the English Ministry have declared repeatedly, in the face of Europe, that they will have no permanent occupation, and will withdraw their troops as soon as a solid and self-supporting government has been established in Egypt. The rule of Tewfik has only been a nominal one. His authority would be *nil* were our forces withdrawn. His return to Cairo under the flag of those forces after the bombardment of Alexandria, and the continued employment at high salaries of large numbers of foreign Ministers and ministerial subordinates forced upon him by France and England, has added to his unpopularity. How then, if we are to accept Mr. Gladstone's avowed determination, are we to obtain the desired stability of native rule? how are we to provide for a *modus vivendi* between Egypt and the Soudan, and between Egypt and Europe at large? Apart from all other complications, the existence of the capitulations and the baneful law of liquidation make it almost impossible to give a satisfactory answer to this difficult question. It would seem, then, that some solution must be discovered which shall abolish the law of liquidation and modify the capitulations; if they cannot also disappear, and which shall at the same time place in authority a man who is capable of enforcing order and maintaining his position. Tewfik is not such a man, and would, I believe, be glad to be free from his impossible position; nor is Halim the man—Halim, with his old-world notions and his subserviency to the Porte.

But I fully believe that Ismail is. He was wrongfully dispossessed by the Tory Government, in obedience to the financial influence of France. He has learnt a bitter lesson, and he is a man of ability enough to profit by it. He is a man, as we all know, capable of governing, and of making his government respected. He knows how to maintain peace between the Arabs of the Soudan and the fellahen of Egypt. If it is by payments to some of the chiefs that he accomplished it, that is assuredly better than slaughtering thousands of their people at the cost of hundreds of valuable British lives and millions of British treasure; and is no more immoral than the pecuniary assistance we give to an Afghan Ameer, or to many a native Indian prince. But how are we to enable him to re-enter on his government with the certainty of paying his way, and at the same time to do away with the law of liquidation once for all? There is only one way. It is a bold but an effective one. Give an English guarantee of 2 or 2½ per cent. on the whole capital of the debt, and then enter into an alliance with Ismail, offensive and defensive, and provide, of course, in the treaty for the payment of the interest. The guarantee would involve no risk to us and no payment by us; for the Egyptian revenue of nine millions would be ample to secure the payment of the amount guaranteed, viz., between two millions and two millions and a half, and to meet besides all the charges of the Egyptian Government. And the bondholders would gain largely, as their capital would be secure and rise in value, though the interest would be diminished. In return Ismail must be given absolute freedom from foreign interference, from French intrigue. The law of liquidation would be abolished expressly by our guarantee, and the capitulations would have to disappear, as they disappeared in Tunis. M. Barrère and Sir E. Baring would return to be of service to their respective countries elsewhere, and ordinary consular representatives should take their place. It would be our duty to insist on the restored Khedive being left to himself, and the result would be that peace would return to the distracted country, and a responsible Government, which for six years we have been in vain endeavouring to establish, would be at length installed. And here, before I close, let me say that I earnestly hope that at the Conference now sitting in Paris on the question of the Suez Canal we shall enter into no embarrassing engagements which may hamper our liberty of action, and tend to produce a crop of future ills.

I have done, and my last word is, that thus by a policy at once bold and safe would English reputation be recovered, and a stable Government restored to Egypt, in accordance with the promise of an English Ministry, while the real interests alike of Europe, Egypt, and our Eastern Empire would be best consulted.

JULIAN GOLDSMID.

ETON IN EIGHTY-FIVE.

Eton has been much discussed of late in newspapers and reviews, but the writing has been exclusively on one side,—either avowedly or in effect hostile in its criticism. Most assailants of Eton have professed admiration or affection for the school in general, but have excepted some particular point as vitiating what otherwise would be praiseworthy. Unluckily different writers take different exceptions, and Eton is left in the condition of the picture which a painter hung up in the market-place, with a request that each critic would mark in charcoal what he considered defective. Within the last few months some notice has been attracted by an article entitled *Confessions of an Eton Master*, which should rather have been ascribed to “a late Eton Master.” The title is not unimportant, for I have lately met persons who, far from regarding the article as a Parthian shot, assumed the writer to have been, when the article appeared, still an energetic member of the Eton staff, and upon that assumption based the theory that we are in a state of mutiny, or at least a house divided against itself. I believe that nothing can be farther from the case, and I feel one reason for my belief in the heartiness with which all Eton masters alike have combined to carry out successfully certain changes of work made by the new head master—changes which undoubtedly in their first start involved considerable trouble, and the immediate success of which would have been prejudiced by disloyal or half-hearted workers.

A difficulty also arises from a confusion of dates and periods in certain articles which have appeared. Old Etonians sometimes write as if there had been no change at Eton in the last half century. The real or imaginary faults of Eton are repeated and brought up over and over again in almost the same words, when much that is deprecated has long ceased to exist. An article by Lord Darnley in the March number of a popular magazine appears to have been written without full knowledge of the changes effected between the writer's own schoolboy days and last year, and in total ignorance of those which were introduced last autumn and were already in working order when his article was published. For this ignorance the writer cannot be blamed, inasmuch as he states that he was writing before the new order of things had become known beyond the limits of the school; but it may be suggested that, as the school was known to be under new government, the article might have been delayed until the facts could be ascertained. Nor is it easy to see in what way a minute description of the system pursued in a particular

pupil-room in 1845, however amusing it may be to read, can prove that the system in 1885 is generally wrong.

Another critic admits that we have made reforms, but affirms that "Eton wants not reform but revolution." These words may have no particular meaning, or, in polite phraseology, they may be an epigrammatic saying; but if they were intended to bear their obvious sense, it may be remarked that no historian ever justified revolution, except on the theory that those who worked it had no other escape from a system clearly undesirable and giving no hope of a gradual reform. Those persons who desire not reform but revolution at Eton, desire a school of another *nature* (for that is implied by the words), and the question may be asked, Why not select a different school? It was hard upon the so-called ugly duckling when the cat found fault with him because he did not purr.

An article which attempted to meet all the different points of attack would become involved in so many disconnected arguments, that I propose rather to give a short account of the most important changes made in recent years, and the existing state of education at Eton, so that those who wish to form a judgment may be able to form it for themselves.

It is necessary to look back to the period of the Royal Commission on Public Schools, rather more than twenty years ago. The great educational change at Eton before that time—I mean the inclusion of mathematics in the school course—is well known to all who are interested in the subject. No one, I suppose, imagines Eton to be now the purely classical school which she was before the reign of Dr. Hawtrey. It may be well, however, to notice that the teaching of mathematics has been constantly improved since that time, not only by the placing of the mathematical masters on an equality with other masters in school authority and influence, but also by the increased number of masters, by their efficiency, by the system of teaching, and by the arrangement of hours. Since Dr. Warre became head master, it has been provided that every mathematical school should have a full hour instead of the usual three-quarters of an hour. Lower boys have now five hours a week of mathematical schools, besides the exercises done out of school, fifth form have four, instead of three for all the school as formerly; and the improvement is already attested by the external examiner, who reports to the governing body at the end of every school time. It is not to be supposed that the general standard of mathematics at Eton can be as high as at schools which profess to be principally mathematical; but the average knowledge of mathematics and industry in this subject have increased and are increasing; and there is greater scope for individual excellence since Dr. Hornby introduced a system by which, in the First Hundred of the school, a boy of a mathematical

turn is enabled to devote to mathematics four hours in the week, in addition to the regular mathematical hours, while other boys are employed according to their taste upon classics, history, modern languages, of science.¹

It is only since the Public Schools Commission that any modern language has formed part of the compulsory school work. First Dr. Balston introduced French into the course for part of the school; then under Dr. Hornby two schools in the week were allotted to this subject throughout the school up to the First Hundred; at that point French might be dropped, or retained as one of the "extra studies" mentioned above. In all cases the lessons were prepared, and the exercise written, out of school.² Lastly, under Dr. Warre, within the last few months, the number of French schools has been doubled; the staff increased, and, it has been provided that each school shall last an hour instead of three-quarters of an hour as before. Each boy does two of the French lessons with his division master in the same way as a classical lesson, and two with one of the French masters. It has also been provided that boys above Middle Fifth who have a certain proficiency in French may wholly or in part substitute German for French. In the First Hundred, German may be taken up as one of the "extra studies," and a scheme is in contemplation by which any boy in that part of the school may substitute German for Greek, which may already be done by all members of the Army class. Italian can be taken up as an "extra study" in the First Hundred; elsewhere only as an extra lesson out of school hours.

The teaching of science throughout the school was introduced by Dr. Hornby. It does not claim the same number of hours as mathematics or classics; but the staff and the appliances are such that every boy gains some knowledge of what a scientific training means; his interest, if he has any, is awakened, and those who have a real taste for any particular branch of natural science have now the opportunity of pursuing it so as to gain a real knowledge of their subject. It is from no indifference to the interest and value of natural science that I believe it not to be the best main branch of education for the majority of boys. Most find an attraction in the easy outside; some few will throw themselves into that accurate labour which alone gives a good

(1) Six hours a week, from 9.45 to 10.45 each day, are allotted to what is called "the extra studies" of the First Hundred, but it should be understood that they are not voluntary, nor an extra in the ordinary sense. There is a large choice of subjects, from which each boy *must* select employment for four schools a week; and he *may* attend six. These schools were an addition to the old school hours.

(2) Dr. Hornby provided for these changes by adding a school on the half-holiday morning, so that the half-holiday had three schools. Dr. Warre has added a fifth school, at 9.45, to the whole school day. At the present date, therefore, the whole holiday has one school, the half-holiday three, and the whole school day five.

mental training. But it is an undoubted advantage for the school that all should have some ideas about the world around them, and should be able to gauge their powers for advancing farther in research. This, I believe, has been secured. As regards the learning of history, I may mention that the history class in the "extra studies" gives boys in the highest part of the school an opportunity of devoting considerable time to deeper historical study than comes into the ordinary school course.

It is clear from the above I fear rather tedious enumeration of school lessons, that there has in the last twenty years been a considerable addition to the school hours and to the subjects taught, and also that the addition has been progressive. But it is said by some that this *πολυμαθία*, this multiplicity of subjects, is a mere "bustle and profession;" that nothing is taught really, that the old idleness and indifference remains, and so forth. I cannot agree with this opinion, whether I test it by my own impressions or by actual results. Have we reached an ideal industry? Certainly not; nor even a point with which human beings may be content. I believe, however, that the average both of work and knowledge has much increased, and is increasing. I have pointed out the addition of certain subjects to the old school curriculum. Is the knowledge of classics and mathematics less than it was before this addition was made? My own impressions lead me to say that it is not less as regards the best scholars, and that it is much greater in the mass of boys; and reports of examiners and statistics of examinations seem to tell the same tale.

In the Oxford and Cambridge certificate examinations for the last ten years 560 entered their names, of whom about 60 were prevented by illness or other causes from going through the examination. Out of this number 337 obtained certificates, and 302 distinctions were awarded. (The distinctions were obtained by 146 boys.) I believe that in this matter Eton can compare favourably with any other school; and the boys take it, so to speak, in their stride, without any halt in their regular course to prepare for it. If we turn to the evidence of the Universities, it is shown in a list of the Eton honours just published in the school list, that in the last ten years at Cambridge 57 first-classes and 71 university prizes and scholarships, at Oxford 73 first-classes (in Moderations and Final Schools) and 39 scholarships and fellowships have been obtained by Etonians. This is an advance upon the tabulated records in the reports of the Public Schools Commission of 1864, which in itself was not a discreditable list of *first-class* distinctions. But I am more concerned to show that, while the number of eminent scholars sent out from Eton has certainly not diminished, there has been a diffusion of learning through the mass of the school, which enables the less talented boy to make a

creditable show at the University. I happen to have a fairly correct list of classes, below the first, obtained by Etonians in honour schools at Oxford during the last five years. I find that in this period there has been 50 second-classes, 40 third, and 14 fourth; if we add to these the 34 first-classes obtained in the same time, and subtract the classes gained in Moderations, so that there may be no danger of the same person being counted twice, it appears that between 90 and 100 Etonians have obtained honours at Oxford in the last five years; that is to say, fully one-half of those who go up to the University, for the average number of those who go from Eton to Oxford seems to be less than 40 in each year.

It has been an alteration of Dr. Warre's that all the school, with the exception of the First Hundred, should be examined at the end of each school-time, and that promotion should be affected by this examination. Hitherto, there were "collections," which had little reality, at the end of each school-time; "trials," affecting the position in school, came to each boy only once a year. The First Hundred are left as before, their great examination being that for certificates in the summer, and other parts of the year being in most cases occupied with preparations for scholarships, matriculation, or for the army examinations. This increase of examinations is deprecated by many whose opinion should be of weight, but I am convinced that for the mass of the school it is a benefit. It is perfectly true that for those who will really read hard by themselves, adopting some definite line of study and working with a love of work, this change may possibly prove an interruption. But by such boys it is probable that in a very much older state of things, when a copy of verses was almost the only positive call upon their leisure, the best mental training was received. These exceptional boys were not however, strictly speaking, educated in the subjects which they selected; they educated themselves with, or even without, some little advice and guidance.

Here is a description of Eton voluntary work for a boy of this kind given in Lord Metcalfe's diary, which he wrote at Eton in 1800:—

"Thursday, 13th.—Play at four. Read some of Lucan and Cicero. Drew. Read Ariosto with Neville and Shaw. Read Voltaire's Charles XII.

"Friday, 14th.—Read part of Horace's Art of Poetry. Whole school day. Read some Lucan. Drank tea with Hervey after six. We have conquered, and my tutor, not finding an argument against us, was obliged to consent, so that now we do it lawfully. Read Gibbon. Finished Charles XII."

While the few were perhaps getting the best possible mental training, the many undoubtedly suffered. Since that time it has been the object

(1) This refers to his plan of meeting at six in the evening with certain friends for tea and reading. To this belongs an entry which sometimes occurs: "Tremendous jaw from my tutor." The objection was raised because it was an innovation to have any meal between dinner and supper, and the institution of "tea" at Eton dates from this victory of Metcalfe's—the first of his many successes. The passage is taken from *Kaye's Life of Lord Metcalfe*, vol. i.

to make the meshes smaller and smaller.' It is, no doubt, more difficult for a boy to read for himself, as Lord Metcalfe did—to read as much for himself is impossible—but, on the other hand, it is quite impossible for any boy to be as idle as the majority were in those days, or to learn as little, and the obligations to work up to the present date have become more and more stringent. It may be too early to judge of the advantages of this new system of "trials." There was difficulty in organising it on a short notice, a difficulty analogous to that of suddenly mobilising an army corps; but it was successfully carried out, with zeal, I think, on the part of boys as well as masters. My experience is, that it has produced a great increase of attention to the work in hand, and an effort of preparation for the examinations more general than we had before. As it has been found possible to put this examination quite at the end of the school-time, the interruption to teaching has been small. Those who object must remember how many boys there are who do not look far beyond the present time; to how many, therefore, who had passed their examination, the thought, that a year would elapse before the next crisis, tended to make one, at least, of the three intervening school-times a period of comparative indifference. The reports of the external examiners appointed by the Governing Body to take part in the examination at the end of each school-time are valuable as independent criticism of the actual work of the school. We can appeal to them as already bearing witness to the increased industry of the boys.¹

It is probable that no part of the Eton school work has been more attacked, as altogether useless and out of harmony with modern education, than Latin verses; and there are few who would desire that this exercise should hold the place which it held when it formed the chief and most important labour of the week both to masters and boys. But I believe that it may be safely laid down first, that, so long as Latin is taught, verses form a most useful exercise for all boys below the fifth form. They learn the power of varying language and construction better than can be learnt from the elementary stages of Latin prose, and it is an exercise for the worst scholars in ingenuity and activity of thought; while for those who have more literary capacity it becomes more and more a training in accurate scholarship and taste. Probably all who uphold a classical training would regret the disappearance of Latin verse composition from the studies of those who are capable of real scholarship; and although for many years verses have ceased to hold their old prominent position at Eton, though Dr. Hornby wisely allowed the substitution of Latin prose, with the tutor's consent, after upper division trials were passed, yet I am

(1) It is likely also that Dr. Warre's plan of visiting in person occasionally each division while work is going on, will prove useful for controlling and directing the work from time to time.

inclined to think that the composition of the best classical scholars has not fallen below the old standard.

Dr. Warré has not only allowed verses to be dropped when Middle Fifth is reached, but he has made the exercise much less exacting in time both for tutors and boys. The exercises are to be shorter. Except in the Upper Fifth and First Hundred they are begun, and nearly if not quite finished, in a two hours' school on Tuesday at 11, and thus entirely cleared off upon Tuesday; and there is the great relief to the tutor that instead of having to make a finished copy out of each exercise, and therefore often nearly rewriting it, he will, with the boy at his elbow, mark the mistakes and criticise, altering if it pleases him to do so, and securing that the exercise is without positive blunders. The division master will afterwards dictate a model copy, to give a boy an idea how the exercise should be done. In other words, the system will be rather that which is pursued by composition lecturers at the University, and the tutor will employ the time which is saved to him in other ways. He will be able, for instance, to find leisure for more individual teaching or for greater subdivision of classes in "private business," to suit the different requirements of his pupils.

As regards the system of construing with the tutor lessons which are afterwards to be done in school, there has been also a change, not altogether recent, which answered by anticipation a criticism published this year. In very remote times, *all* lessons were construed first with the tutor. This had ceased, certainly before my recollection begins, in the highest division of the school. Then Dr. Hornby some years ago introduced the system of *gradually* emancipating boys from the tutor's "construing," as they rose in the school; and this has been carried a little further by Dr. Warre. So that now neither the First Hundred nor the Upper Fifth have this "construing;" the Middle Fifth have it for two lessons, which are regarded as their hardest subject; the Lower Fifth for four lessons similarly selected; the Remove for all their Latin and Greek lessons. There are two advantages in the present system; first the *gradual* introduction to preparing the lesson without assistance, and secondly the possibility of greater variety of classical books. The extreme of the contrary system was shown in those old times, which some believe still to exist, when all Fifth Form had the same Latin and Greek subjects. This has ceased to be the case for many years; and now the subjects are different for Upper, Middle, and Lower Fifth.

In this retrospect of change in the school course it only remains to speak of the Army class. It has been found that boys lose on the whole intellectually by being separated from their equals and gathered in divisions made out of different parts of the school. On

the other hand, Latin appears in nearly all cases to be an advantageous subject to take up, and Greek also, in the case of abler boys; inasmuch as hitherto all who have passed in the first ten or twelve in the Sandhurst list direct from Eton have been boys following the ordinary school course, and taking up both Latin and Greek. At the same time there is a possibility that in the new Sandhurst examinations German may be found more frequently than was formerly the case to have the advantage over Greek. The system therefore now adopted is that boys remain for classics with their own divisions, with this exception, that instead of Greek schools, those who wish may go to German; and French or mathematics may be substituted for science when that subject is not taken up. Special classes out of school hours are formed for those who have not passed the "preliminary."

I am not here discussing what are the best subjects for education, but merely what will, as is said, "pay best" in the competition for Sandhurst. It is a break in our course to meet a special need of the day; but such breaks for particular cases cannot be indefinitely multiplied at a public school. This concession to special work was made both because we do not like to lose from Eton the type of boy which goes into the army; and also because we flatter ourselves that Her Majesty's Service gains by the admixture of those who come direct from their public school. Nor do I inquire whether valuable officers may not be lost to the army because they are incapable of success in a literary competition. From the very nature of a competitive examination there must be some boys to whom no method can ensure success. At a public school there may be a few who cannot even for so important a reason in any degree separate themselves from those who are not preparing for a special examination, or give any voluntary effort of their own. For such boys a private tutor may give a better chance. A few others who in spite of industry have a very small chance in a competition may possibly somewhat better it by learning French or German colloquially abroad. But with these two exceptions I feel sure that no boy need fear to stay on at Eton and go up direct from the school for the Sandhurst examination, and I am inclined to hold the same belief with regard to Woolwich.

It will be seen that there is no "modern side" at Eton, and I do not think that there is any intention of establishing one. This is not from any blind conservatism, nor because classical masters oppose it, or have any interest in opposing it, but because evidence, so far as it can be gathered from other schools, seems to show that it is rather a hindrance than a help to learning of all kinds. Of course able and intelligent boys may come out of a "modern side," as able and intelligent boys may go into it; but there is no reason to believe that this intelligence has been better cultivated there; and, on the other hand,

those who press into the modern side are those who seek to avoid mental effort and those who are supposed to be capable of little, so that there is a tendency of the dull or the idle to make one another more dull or more idle. I was lately told by an ex-head-master of great reputation and ability, that in his old school, amid many disadvantages, the chief advantage which could be found in the modern side was that the other divisions of the school were relieved for teaching purposes by the subtraction of the duller element.

I do not mean to deny that there may in some schools be excellent management of the modern side and some good results to show, but evidence of the kind which I have mentioned has led us to think that in a public school boys should in the main have a common field of literature and a uniform system of promotion, and that if classics are to be the preponderating element, they should be so throughout, except that in the upper parts of the school certain differences may be allowed for those who in view of some approaching special examination may be expected to work readily at special subjects.

And this leads naturally to the question why classics *should* preponderate—why Greek, for instance, should not be dropped altogether. I feel some hesitation about giving the answer in my own words, lest I should be called a prejudiced witness. We are told that classics are maintained because men come to be assistant masters who have taken a high classical degree, and can teach nothing but classics. My own belief is that those who have taken a high classical degree are not ill-fitted, if they have any power of teaching at all, to become teachers of history or modern literature. Much of their training has been connected with the study of history, still more with literary criticism and the cultivation of style; nor is there that wide gulf between things ancient and things modern which is sometimes imagined. It is not, I think, from this feeling that classical apologists uphold the teaching of classics; but still I prefer to convey my opinion by quoting from the report of the Public School Commissioners, who cannot have been influenced by any sense of advantage or convenience to themselves.

They say of classics, "It is not without reason that the foremost place has been assigned to this study. Grammar is the logic of common speech, and there are few educated men who are not sensible of the advantages they gained as boys from the steady practice of composition and translation. The study of literature is the study, not indeed of the physical, but of the intellectual and moral world we live in, and of the thoughts, lives, and characters of those men whose writings or whose character succeeding generations have thought it worth while to preserve. We are convinced that the best materials available to Englishmen for these studies are furnished by the language and literature of Greece and Rome. From the regular structure of these languages, from their severe canons of taste and style,

from the very fact that they are "dead"; and have been handed down to us directly from the periods of their highest perfection, they are, beyond all doubt, the finest and most serviceable models we have for the study of language. As literature they supply some of the noblest poetry, the finest eloquence, the deepest philosophy, the wisest historical writing; and these excellences are such as to be appreciated keenly though inadequately by young minds, and to leave, as in fact they do, a lasting impression. Besides this it is at least a reasonable opinion that this literature has had a powerful effect in moulding and animating the statesmanship and political life of England.

"Nor is it to be forgotten that the whole civilisation of modern Europe is really built upon the foundation laid two thousand years ago by two highly civilised nations on the shores of the Mediterranean; that their languages supply the key to our modern tongues; their poetry, history, philosophy, and law to the poetry and history, the philosophy and jurisprudence, of modern times; that this key can seldom be acquired except in youth, and that the possession of it, as daily experience proves, is very far from being merely a literary advantage. . . It is not necessary to be clever in order to gain solid advantages from the study of Latin and Greek; it is only necessary to be attentive, a condition equally indispensable to progress in any other study. Whether for an assemblage of boys of a uniformly low intellectual calibre it would not be practicable to devise some other form of instruction, which might be made, when perfected by time, as good an instrument of mental discipline as that which we recommend, is a question to which experience has not yet supplied a satisfactory answer. We entertain, however, no doubt that a boy of ordinary capacity, and even a dull and backward boy, is likely to profit more on the whole in a school where he has highly educated masters, and travels the same road with companions who are being highly educated, than he would be under a system lowered to the pitch of his own intellectual powers."¹

The concluding words should be noticed, for they convey a truth often overlooked by those who clamour for easier subjects—studies more suited to commonplace minds, and so forth—a truth, in fact, which seems to underlie that defect in a "modern side" which has been mentioned. The arguments for a classical education which I have quoted are those of such men as Mr. Halford Vaughan and the late Lord Clarendon, who knew better than most men the value of modern languages and literature; the late Lord Lyttelton and Sir Stafford Northcote, who could judge how far their high classical scholarship prepared them for public life; the present Master of Trinity, who could gauge more accurately than most the results of

classical teaching at the University. They are the words of Commissioners selected by Parliament precisely because there was a feeling of dissatisfaction with some features in the public school teaching and management at that time. Many changes have, as I have shown, followed their recommendations; but it is clear that, while they wished more attention to be given to mathematics, modern languages, and science, and facilities for certain boys to attain great proficiency in these studies, they did *not* wish that Latin and Greek should cease to be the staple of public school education; and I, for one, believe them to have been right.

It is surprising to me to find the study of classics condemned on the ground of practical uselessness in after life, by the very same persons who say that mathematics ought to be taught because boys will find the knowledge practically useful. I doubt if many who hold these views could, after a few moments' consideration, affirm that they had ever, for any single purpose of life, employed any mathematics at all, unless the simplest rules of arithmetic are dignified by that name. For one who enters certain scientific professions—for the engineer, for instance, or for one engaged in a scientific study, such as astronomy—a knowledge of mathematics is essential, and will be constantly of practical use; but for the majority no occasion will arise for employing directly even elementary algebra or Euclid. In truth, the teaching of mathematics stands on different and, to my mind, much higher ground. If we put aside the question of literary culture, the benefit for the majority derived from mathematics and classics alike consists in the education of their reasoning faculty. It has always seemed to me that, except the highest mathematics, which probably stand first, there is nothing for the mere strengthening of logical power more efficient than the accurate study of Latin and Greek; but however that may be, it is as much a mistake to base the teaching of either classics or mathematics upon future usefulness in practice, as it is to leave out of sight altogether the literary advantages of the ancient languages which are so forcibly expressed in the words which I have quoted above.

Of late the attack has been chiefly upon Greek. Latin, it is said, cannot be given up, because it has been so long bound up with all liberal education that some knowledge of it is necessary to everyone who professes to be educated at all; besides, it has practical utility, not only as being the foundation of the Romance languages, but also as entering into many technical matters, and bearing directly upon the study of law and medicine. This is all very true, but it would be right to inquire if there are not kindred arguments for Greek. Personally, I should be satisfied with feeling, as the Commissioners felt, that both languages together form for most boys, in conjunction with mathematics, the best mental and logical training, and for all the best

foundation of literary culture; but there are other considerations which should surely touch the utilitarian school. Lord Darnley, who, I am glad to see, upholds the teaching of Greek, speaks of the advantages of knowing the meaning of metamorphosis, or of the termination of Sebāstopol. It might be added to this, that nearly the whole of the scientific nomenclature is formed from Greek, so that a layman reading a scientific treatise has a better chance of readily understanding it if he can see at a glance the connection of the terms "palæozoic" and "primary," for instance, or the difference between "endoskeleton" and "exoskeleton."

But there is much more than this on the utilitarian side in favour of Greek—so much more, that I am sometimes tempted to think that many writers and speakers have forgotten that there is a living Greek language, printed and accentuated exactly in the same manner as the Thucydides of their boyhood. The best Latin scholar would not find it easy, by the aid of his Latin alone, to get at the meaning of an article in the *Popolo Romano*, but an average sixth form boy could take up the Athenian *Ἐφημερίς* and gather news from it. "How pedantic," I have often heard it said, "to require accuracy of accents." But the modern newspaper writer at Athens uses them as carefully as Aristophanes the grammarian, and pronounces accordingly; and, though this hypothetical sixth form boy could not, when he landed at Piræus, understand spoken Greek, he would not either be wholly at a loss in a written conversation, and his progress towards speaking would be easy.

Upon the claims of Latin and Greek to form the staple of public school education depends the Eton tutorial system. So long as the greater part of a boy's time is given to classics, he requires a classical tutor. Those most opposed to the system admit that "it is an advantage to a boy to have, throughout all his school career, one person to whom he can always look for advice and assistance," but it is suggested that his house tutor, whether a classical tutor or not, would fulfil all requirements. Undoubtedly he would to a great degree, and to him the boy does look for advice and assistance; but surely it is of great importance that there should be also one person under whose notice falls the greater part of a boy's work in all his school career, who has worked with him through all that time, and who, when he receives a good or bad report from the classical division master as regards his pupil's proficiency, knows whether he is comparatively better or worse than he was before. This place is filled by the classical tutor, and he is enabled, by his knowledge of a boy's powers and his connection with his studies, to supply what is needed either in help or in addition to work. The school system must be on some average line, and whether a boy is above or below it, the tutorial system can remedy defects. Some boys may need more "private business," some less; some may

have time for writing English essays, for instance, in addition to their ordinary work; others may need this exercise but have little time, and thereupon may be allowed some remission of their classical private business. For all such matters of adjustment I fail to see how anything but our present tutorial system can be efficient.

I see that Mr. Salt puts down as an indispensable reform, that "*all the regular school work except, perhaps,*¹ in the upper part of the school, should be done under supervision, instead of being left to the boy's discretion as to the time and method of preparation." This is indeed not reform, but revolution; for I can conceive nothing more subversive of the English public school system, which is supposed to fit boys for the more complete liberty of after life, by showing that trust is placed in them and that they may forfeit their right to such trust if they misuse it. Even if it were true that, to most, their liberty "is a liberty to be idle," which I utterly deny, still I should prefer it to this universal supervision. Let those who will sneer at this doctrine of liberty "preached from the pulpit" to Eton boys. I believe that the lesson of responsible and conditional liberty is one of the best, if not the best, to teach, whether in the pulpit or elsewhere, at all times, and not least in these present days. It has been well said, that "the principle of governing boys mainly through their own sense of what is right and honourable is undoubtedly the true principle." The idea of discipline at Eton is well grounded, and easy for anyone with reasonable discretion to maintain; the sense of honour here is high, and the notion of working for duty's sake is not so uncommon as some outsiders appear to think. Shall we gain or lose as educators by enacting that nothing is expected but what is enforced, nothing believed but what is seen?

As matters stand at present, a boy who clearly neglects his work, is ordered to prepare in pupil-room what otherwise he would be trusted to prepare at his own time, and he himself would admit the justice of the order. For those who do not so temporarily forfeit their right to liberty, there is, from that time when they are quite young and working more under supervision, a relaxation, and a leave to go without leading-strings. The reform would give us a whole school, with a possible exception of the highest division, forced into precisely the same hours under precisely the same supervision, dull and clever, idle and industrious, for all their work. In short, it would give us the system of a French *lycée* rather than an English public school. I have endeavoured to show that Eton is not neglectful of work nor averse to any changes which will make the work better or more profitable, but that she should change her very nature I neither expect nor desire; nor, I believe, do many of those who have a knowledge of the school or a claim to be heard upon the subject.

(1) The italics are my own.

, THE QUEEN AND HER FAMILY.

WHEN Queen Adelaide obtained from Parliament, in 1831, an annuity of £100,000, the country was engaged upon the first Reform Bill, to which her Majesty was supposed to have been unfriendly. The position of the Sovereign and of the royal family in the campaign of 1884—85 has been untouched by the contest, and the proposal of an annuity for the only unmarried child of her Majesty affords a fitting opportunity for consideration of a subject of great public interest. Every candidate has learnt, or will soon be made aware of the vivid concern with which working-class electors regard the increase of royal grants and pensions. This is due to several causes, among which aversion to monarchy has not a prominent place. It is rather owing to the indefinite character of such claims, and to a desire for economy. Uninformed as to the complex details of general expenditure, they fasten upon these additions as matters easy to be understood, against which resistance raises a clear and simple issue.

I have no confidence that I shall succeed in making an intelligible presentation of this subject, but a public service of value might be rendered by a clear statement of the royal claim, of the treatment it has received, together with some suggestion as to the future. It is desirable to allay that uncertainty which, by giving rise to vague apprehensions, leads to pledges such as would neither be given nor demanded if the financial arrangements between the Sovereign, her family, and the people were better understood and more closely defined.

It is my earnest wish that, in reference to the Crown and to those who may succeed to that highest estate, there should be a reversion to the tone adopted by Radicals in the earlier part of the century. They were not less firm, but their language bore the mark of self-respect. They referred to the Crown without fear, but always in words which accorded to its place in the commonwealth. As an example, I would point to the speech of Mr. Grote when supporting, in 1837, a motion for a reduction, by £50,000, of her Majesty's Civil List. He protested against the doctrine,

“That the respect which the House entertained for the Sovereign was to be measured by its willingness to grant money for the use of the Crown.” He would maintain the direct contrary, and assert that the best friends to the maintenance of the respectability of the Crown were those who were most anxious that it should not appear in the light of an odious and unnecessary burden on the shoulders of the people.” .

The English monarchy is unquestionably illustrious; its annals form no unimportant part of our national history. Regarded as an institution it can never be contemptible. There are tens of thousands of Englishmen who have no prejudice in favour even of a system of government so long and loyally accepted; they would accept any system which insured the highest price of Three per Cents., and though some may despise that test as unworthy, it is by no means a bad one, as to the utility of a system of government. Throughout the United Kingdom, there could not be found a man of intelligence who would deny that the monarchy satisfies this test. In spite of that which is, I think, mischievously and wrongly called "separatist" opinion, I do not except Ireland. There is no demand for disunion from the Crown. I question if there are ten Irishmen capable of forming an opinion, who believe that the shares of the eight Irish Banks would, through all these years of trouble, have held so equal a value with those of the Bank of England, were there any probability of such a separation.

The Crown of the United Kingdom is endowed with certain land revenues, and with the valuable estates attached to the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall, the latter being appropriated to the enjoyment of the Heir Apparent. Upon the demise of the Crown, the land revenues immediately revert to the uncrowned sovereign, and it is usual for the new monarch to draw at once upon the growing produce of the land revenues for current expenditure until the Civil List has been sanctioned by Parliament. Upon the last demise of the Crown there was a dissolution of Parliament. By a provision of the Reform Act, 1867, the death of the sovereign does not now cause a dissolution. Her Majesty followed the language of her predecessor when, in addressing Parliament on November 20th, 1837, she said to the "Gentlemen of the House of Commons:"—

"The demise of the Crown renders it necessary that a new provision shall be made for the Civil List. I place unreservedly at your disposal those hereditary revenues which were transferred to the public by my immediate predecessor, and I have commanded that such papers as may be necessary for the full examination of the subject shall be prepared and laid before you."

This speech, which is the usage of English sovereigns, placed all property in charge of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, and the royal parks, of which the Crown claims the freehold, now in charge of the First Commissioner of Works, at the service of the public, with reversion to her Majesty's successor.

It will be observed that the words limit the transfer to that made by William IV. This is intended to guard the estates of the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall, as the property of the Sovereign. It was held by Lord Melbourne's Government that without the consent of the Crown the House of Commons cannot discuss a proposition to

bring those Duchies under Parliamentary control. The customary surrender of the land revenues made over to the Exchequer a net income which in 1839 was worth only £180,000. The gross income is now £500,000, and the net £380,000. The error of supposing that the Civil List is an equivalent for the surrender of the land revenues is very common. The Civil List of £385,000, granted to her Majesty on her accession, was nearly double the net value of the land revenues, after providing for repayment to the Exchequer of sums drawn on account of those revenues before the passing of the Act. The Civil List is divided into six classes, which are set out in a schedule :—

	£
Class 1. Privy Purse	60,000
„ 2. Salaries of her Majesty's Household and Retired Allowances	131,260
3. Expenses of her Majesty's Household	172,500
4. Royal Bounty, Alms, and Special Services	13,200
5. Pensions, limited to £1,200 a year	
6. Unappropriated Moneys	8,040
	<hr/>
	£385,000

The duty of audit, without publication, is imposed upon the Treasury, and there is a limited power of transferring a surplus in one class to cover a deficiency which may have occurred in another class. The Assistant Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Sir R. Welby) is auditor of the Civil List, and two of the Treasury clerks are specially engaged as Civil List clerks. An Act was passed in 1862 "To remove doubts concerning, and to amend the law relating to, the private estates of her Majesty." This statute enabled her Majesty, her heirs and successors, to possess and dispose of private estates, and it provided: "That a will or other testamentary disposition by her Majesty, her heirs or successors, of or concerning any such private estates, shall not require publication." This Act particularly referred to estates purchased "out of any moneys issued and applied for the use of her or their privy purse, or with any other moneys not appropriated to the public service." In 1873 another Act was passed to "explain and amend" that of 1862, with the object of rendering it certain that her Majesty may give such estates to members of her family, or, in the words of the Act, "to any one who is, or may be, King or Queen of the Realm."

It is no part of my task to look into the circumstances which have prolonged her Majesty's retirement. The Act of 1862 seems to apply to savings in any class of the Civil List, but it is probably incorrect that the Queen's retirement causes very large savings. There are one hundred and twenty officers of the royal household whose salaries—of which that of Lord Tennyson at £100 is, I believe, the

lowest—amount to more than £52,000 a year. There are besides some five hundred persons engaged in and about the royal palaces, whose pay and allowances amount to a much larger sum. These are constant payments. A scanty Court is not desirable. Probably the opinion of a good many was expressed by Lord John Russell, in 1837, when he said “that Members would be rather surprised if, when the Speaker of that House reached the royal palace, they should find only two footmen to show them the way.” The Chancellor of the Exchequer of that day justified the Civil List containing all these salaries by reference to the price of meat and butter, which he estimated respectively at 5d. and 1s. a pound.

Some of the salaries and payments from the Civil List may be open to revision, and there are charges now imposed on the public which ought to be transferred to the Civil List. But, on the whole, the amount does not appear excessive for the active discharge of the manifold duties and obligations of royalty, and we may now pass to consider the claims of the family of the Sovereign. It has been the custom for Parliament to grant an annuity to every prince and princess of the blood-royal, either upon majority, orphanage, or marriage. An example is found in the family of the Duke of Cambridge. Each of his sisters, the Grand Duchess of Mecklenburg-Strelitz and the Duchess of Teck, receives a Parliamentary annuity of £3,000 a year, and his Royal Highness obtained in 1850 a similar annuity of £12,000 for life, with condition that it should cease if he became King of Hanover. All the children of the sons of her Majesty will have claims the same as those of the Duke of Cambridge and his sisters. The Queen's daughters have become German princesses—the youngest is about to become a German princess—and the rank and fortunes of their children will not be regulated by English arrangements. Including the provision for Princess Beatrice, the total annuity voted by Parliament for the sons and daughters of the Queen amounts to £157,000. By the death of the Duke of Albany and of the Princess Alice the payment is reduced to £132,000.

According to precedent, the children not only of the Prince of Wales, but also of the Dukes of Edinburgh, Connaught, and Albany, will be entitled to annuities. As to the Duke of Edinburgh, the claim will lapse upon the death of his uncle, the Grand Duke of Saxe-Coburg Gotha. Parliament will insist upon definition and restriction of these claims. There can be no doubt that the interests of the royal family require avoidance of an indefinite demand upon the public and of the creation of a numerous royal caste. No considerate friend of monarchy would propose that the attributes of royalty should be continued to remote generations. The settlement of this delicate matter should be made by the Sovereign in council with a wise and discreet Minister. It is not desirable, for the same interests,

that application should be made to Parliament on behalf of those princes and princesses who do not stand next to the throne. When the Duke of Cambridge's annuity of £12,000 was discussed, Mr. Bright proposed that the sum should be the limit of the Duke's income from the public funds, and it is certainly advisable that in the case of all pensions there should be a liability to deduction in respect of any subsequent income from the same sources. The grandson of an English duke may be a commoner, without even a title by courtesy, and it would probably tend to the security of monarchy if, under like conditions, the grandson of the Sovereign were not a "Royal Highness," and if the great-grandson became an untitled commoner. This follows when a daughter of the Sovereign marries a subject not of royal blood. If this were the rule, the grandchildren of the Duke of Connaught would be in the same position as those of the Princess Louise.

Suppose we had to reconsider the Civil List. The Sovereign might be advised to determine anew the status of members of the Royal Family remote from the throne. The next question might be that of rights in the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall. The estates of the former are more scattered than those of the latter. The annual value is about £45,000. The income of the Duchy of Cornwall is £65,000 a year. The system of managing corporate estates from Whitehall has only to be examined to be condemned. If it is good, then Mr. George's system, which does for the land as a whole what this system does in part, must be better. But, indeed, it is radically wasteful and injurious. The Sovereign might, therefore, be advised to surrender the hereditary rights in these Duchies, with the concurrence of the Prince of Wales as to Cornwall. The important question as to hereditary revenues derived from the Crown Lands would come next. The Sovereign might be counselled to do more than surrender in the usual way the hereditary rights of the Crown in this property. The income has risen rapidly by the purchase of ground rents in and about Fleet Street, and by the enormous advance of rents upon grant of new building leases, as in the case of "the Criterion." The Treasury has now full power to sell the 70,000 acres of farm lands, and, in fact, all lands except the royal parks, forests, and chases. But this power of sale is practically conditional on the purchase of other lands. There should be a separation of all Crown lands into two categories: 1. Those necessary for royal dignity, public offices, and public recreation; 2. Those which have no such character. Provision might be made for handing over by Act of Parliament the lands of the first class to the charge of the Office of Works, and those of the second class, together with surplus estates of the surrendered Duchies, to a commission, with compulsory and absolute powers of sale in such manner as would be most beneficial to public interests.

The Office of Woods and Forests might then be abolished, and the official staff utilised in the work of this temporary commission. If this were well done there would be a saving of more than £50,000 a year.

Then would follow the Civil List to be recommended to Parliament. Monarchy must be magnificent; but without any reduction in that respect there would probably be reform in the royal household. At present, on a change of Government, the Minister nominates to offices in the household of which the aggregate pay is more than £21,000 a year. It might be thought desirable to increase the Civil List, to strengthen the audit, and, in place of applications to Parliament for annuities, to make provision for the children of the Sovereign by an official system of insurance in connection with the Civil List, leaving intact those rights of possessing and disposing of private property which her Majesty has obtained, but repealing the privilege as to publication of royal wills.

I do not expect much from the Committee which Mr. Gladstone has announced. The formation of a Select Committee is one of the fine arts of Parliamentary management, and its report would probably in such a case reflect the master minds of its nominators. Consultation with the leaders of Opposition has been customary upon proposals affecting the royal family, in order that a seemingly concurrence should be observed in debate. I have less confidence in a Select Committee than in the House at large. The majority of people may be of opinion that without revision of the Civil List there should be no further application to Parliament. Mr. Gladstone's Committee will be precluded from all reference to the Civil List and to the Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster. It would have to consider, in the light of precedents, what should be done for the grandchildren of the Sovereign. The status of those personages would be outside the scope of inquiry. I am doubtful if the House of Commons will do well to consent to the appointment of this Committee, because the precedents are well known, and because a Committee is more likely to be lavish than the House, which acts under direct observation of the electors. It seems to me that the solitary advantage of a Committee may be in the opportunity which the discussion of its report would afford to the Minister for learning the opinion of the House of Commons before he is moved to consider the endowment of distant royalty.

ARTHUR ARNOLD.

SPECIALISM IN MEDICINE.

AMONG so many changes of wider importance, the revolution of opinion which has taken place in regard to specialism in the practice of the healing art is likely to be overlooked. Yet any one who should take the trouble to glance through the medical journals of twenty-five years ago and compare the tone of their remarks on this subject with that of those of the present day could not fail to be struck by the contrast. Then the very name of "specialist" was a bar sinister excluding a man from the more highly coveted hospital appointments and from admission to some of the principal professional societies. The medical press lost no chance of abusing him; his brethren sneered at him in public and slandered him in private. Is it wonderful, then, that even moderate men brought up in the traditions of old-fashioned medical practice should have looked askance at specialism as something not quite orthodox, or at least of questionable respectability? This treatment, on the other hand, produced its natural effect on specialists, leading them sometimes into errors of taste and judgment, for which only the excuse of extreme provocation could be pleaded. It is a significant fact that the hostility to specialism not only originated within the medical profession, but has been all along almost entirely confined to that body. Was the cause of this dislike mere irrational conservatism, or, as the doctors said, virtuous indignation at an *opprobrium medicinæ* of a novel kind? Or was it rather, as the profane did not hesitate to affirm, the outcome of an undignified jealousy? Perhaps, as human motives are generally mixed, all these forces were at work. Specialism was a new thing, and the conservative instincts of the College of Physicians were strong against innovation. It may have had a presentiment that the new dispensation would change the order of things and sweep away old landmarks. In the days of periwigs and gold-headed canes it had striven to hold the surgeons, and at a later period the apothecaries, in subjection to its authority; in the same way it now opposed the emancipation of specialists.

Now everything is changed; specialism has taken its place among recognised institutions, the millennium has come upon the medical world, and the wolf lies down with the lamb in the most edifying manner. Notwithstanding all this, the hatred of specialism is suppressed rather than extinct. The change, such as it is, is entirely due to pressure from without; public opinion has, in fact, declared itself with such emphasis on the side of the specialists that the profession has been coerced into sullen acquiescence in the inevitable. The initiated, however, can see sparks of the still smouldering fire in

many subtle but unmistakable signs. The latent feeling reveals itself in suggestive shrugs of the shoulders or elevation of the eyebrows at the mention of certain names; sometimes even in sly innuendo or in mild detraction, which is all the more effective because it is couched in a tone rather of sorrow than of anger. Again, there is the almost indecent eagerness with which any error or oversight on the part of a specialist is proclaimed, and the too obvious intent with which it is made the text of a discourse on the uselessness of specialists. It may be pointed out that this form of hostility altogether misses its mark, as it is really an unconscious and consequently all the more cogent testimony to the superior skill of the persons attacked. No one thinks any blunder, however gross, on the part of an ordinary physician worth even a momentary feeling of surprise; and if it were to be argued that because one practitioner has erred doctors are useless, what would become of the profession?

If specialists did not meet a distinct want they would soon be driven off the field. It is idle to inquire whether in this instance the demand created the supply, or *vice versa*; all that we are concerned with here is the fact that the public voice decisively approves of the existence of specialists. This is convincingly demonstrated as time goes on by the increasing confidence which is placed in their opinion and advice. A striking confirmation of this is afforded by the circumstance that when medical men have sickness in their own families they put prejudice aside and invoke the assistance of the despised specialist. In my own province it is my pleasure and privilege to treat a large number of my professional brethren with whose personal ailments or those of their wives and children I am occupied during a considerable portion of each working day. Many other specialists are doubtless recipients of the like indisputably sincere form of compliment. The growing favour with which specialism is looked on by the public is also fully recognised by young physicians, and still more by successful general practitioners ambitious of emerging into the more rarefied atmosphere of consulting work. The press of competition is so fierce in the present overcrowded state of the medical profession that unless a man has some peculiar and decided advantage over the general run of his fellows he stands no chance of coming to the front. Something more is necessary nowadays for success in the higher walks of medicine than mere general ability. Supreme talent will, of course, ultimately find its level, unless kept down by accident or misfortune; but for the average clever man there is little prospect of brilliant success unless he has (or can persuade the world he has) the power of doing some particular thing better than any one else, or at any rate pre-eminently well.

It may not unnaturally be asked why specialism was so vehemently opposed by the medical profession. In the first place it was, as

already said, what Americans call, a, "new departure," and as nearly every page of the history of human progress shows, the pioneers of any upward movement have been exceptionally fortunate if they escaped persecution. Again, there is an innate tendency in human nature to look with suspicion on knowledge or skill which is the possession of a select few. The distrust of doctors as a class, which is still sometimes met with (by no means always among the ignorant), is in itself an illustration of this. Coming, however, to more definite examples of this form of jealousy, we find that it especially pervades limited societies of men, as may be seen in the case of guilds and trades-unions. Among the rules of the latter associations, at any rate in their earlier days, there were many which had for their object the reduction of the skilled artisan to the position of the ordinary labourer; indeed, the spirit is the note of a certain form of communism which would lower all men to the same level. The medical Corporations of this country have retained many of their mediæval traditions, and though they have not been able to oppose specialism actively, some of them have by mild ostracism endeavoured to exclude specialists from positions of distinction within their own bodies. It is certain, however, that this natural attitude of mankind towards anything wearing the semblance of monopoly or privilege was, in the case of specialism, deliberately encouraged by a portion of the medical press from motives of enlightened self-interest. When there were twenty thousand general practitioners in England, and only a few hundred specialists, it was obviously in accordance with trade instinct to minister to the prejudices of the greatest number. I am happy to say, however, that there have always been some medical journals which have placed the interests of science above financial prosperity and professional influence, and which, without particularly favouring specialism, have shown an honest independence in the matter. Especially has one important paper, as the organ of a powerful Association, always stood above mere mercantile considerations.

Opposition in the public prints had for good and sufficient reasons to be carried on professedly from a quasi-scientific point of view; there was necessarily more of the argumentative than of the frankly vituperative element in their diatribes on specialism. In private, however, where no such reticence was needed, envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness found the freest expression. At the dinner-table, at the medical societies, in the gossip that relieves the aridity of scientific discussion, at all places where doctors meet do congregate, specialism and its professors were denounced with a wealth of epithet that the refined controversialists of Billingsgate might have envied. The Newcomers of the profession about their heads and angured ill of the "promising young men" who were

already making larger incomes than they themselves had gone at a much later period of their career. It was whispered and even said aloud that specialism was not "respectable."

Now this imputation, if it were allowed, was admirable as a stroke of lance, however a fine moral sense may condemn it. In the heart of the ordinary middle-class John Bull no emotion is stronger than the desire to appear "respectable," in the heart of the medical body corporate this feeling is intensified almost into a passion. The truth is that in this country at least we are just a little doubtful as to our position in the social scale, and we are naturally therefore somewhat ticklish about the matter. Indeed, from the way in which medical men sometimes talk about the "dignity of the profession," it would almost seem as though that were always the first object to be considered. Some of us need to be occasionally reminded that the profession exists for, and I may add by, the public, not the public for the profession. Touching this subject of respectability, a thoughtful foreigner, who has evidently resided many years in this country, has remarked in a little work which has recently appeared, that in England "professions rise or fall in dignity and repute according as they are or are not connected with the State." Not to mention the army and navy, which actually wear the Queen's livery, the clergy through the episcopal bench hold a high position. The Bar again is in close connection with the Crown through the judges and other high legal officers of State; but the medical profession, though a few individuals have personal relations with royalty, includes within its ranks no high functionaries of the realm. Feeling itself therefore to be rather at a disadvantage as compared with its learned sisters, it is anxious to make up for lack of social position by increased respectability. No more poisoned arrow could have been shot against specialism than the allegation that its existence in some way dimmed the lustre of our respectability or lowered the esteem in which the profession is held.

In America, where there is no "leisured class" to look down upon those who labour, the medical faculty is recruited from the best families in the land, and its members accordingly act with an independence quite unknown in this country. Under these circumstances, specialism, instead of meeting with opposition, was received with open arms. I may say that when I was travelling in the United States three years ago nothing astonished me more than the universal diffusion of specialism. It would be almost impossible to find a city with one thousand inhabitants in which there were not at least three or four specialists. Thus in one city, with a population of only one hundred and twenty thousand, I found thirteen specialists exclusively engaged in treating throat diseases. Indeed the practical genius of the American people was never more clearly evinced than in the

manner in which it embraced specialism. In England, on the other hand, there are many towns with a population of fifty or sixty or even a hundred thousand persons without a single laryngoscopist. In France also, where class distinction has been to a great extent done away with, and where there are between thirty and forty doctors in the Chamber of Deputies, the medical profession is much more unconstrained, and accordingly it has not been found necessary to bolster up the position of medical practitioners by artificial codes. This being the case, it is natural to find that specialism has spread much more quickly and established itself much more widely in France than in England. In Germany, again, specialism is almost universal; in fact, this is perhaps one of the strongest points in its favour, as it shows how specialism is a natural development in the midst of the highest culture. The examples of Germany and America prove, moreover, that where education is most widely diffused, there specialism finds the kindest soil to flourish in—a fact which of itself should silence those who do not scruple to hint that it is a mode of trading on human ignorance.

Jealousy of specialism rankles alike in the breast of the "pure" physician and in that of the general practitioner. The former sees his empire slowly but surely passing away, and his place and function in the profession becoming obsolete. I am speaking, of course, of London, where "pure" physic is now represented only by two or three eminent men who maintain their position owing to their connection with the Court, and by a very few (and their number grows less year by year) who, as successful clinical teachers, have established a large *clientèle* amongst their former pupils. Many young doctors, highly equipped with degrees and other academical distinctions, start every year on the race for wealth and honour as "pure" physicians, but the force of circumstances drives them sooner or later, avowedly or not, into a speciality. Although attached to general hospitals and posing there as champions of anti-specialism, they become known to the profession and to the public only as men who have paid special attention to some particular disease, or group of diseases, from which it may be added, they in point of fact derive their entire income. It is only natural and human that amongst those veiled specialists are to be found the most virtuous and virulent opponents of specialism "naked and not ashamed." In like manner operating surgeons are often mere specialists in disguise, though, of course, they would protest in a most life-like tone of outraged innocence if they were accused of such a thing. Specialists, however, they are *ex et foras*, even the most enterprising among them, and the operative speciality at its broadest is after all essentially a narrow one. Many operating surgeons, however, limit their range still further by confining themselves to a single organ or a group of closely interconnected organs.

The general practitioner, on the other hand, is jealous of the specialist, but with less reason. He at least is in no danger of being improved off the face of the earth like the physician; but still, he finds his position with regard to the consultant gradually changing, and not perhaps altogether to his own advantage in some ways. The old relations between consultants and general practitioners were of a very pleasant character. Those "calling in" a certain physician were generally former pupils; by meeting their old teacher they were to some extent kept abreast of advancing knowledge, and any oversight on their part in diagnosis or treatment was sure to be very tenderly handled. This relation is still to a considerable extent kept up in the suburbs of London, but patients are beginning to show much more independence than formerly, and insist on consulting whom they please, the opinion sought being often that of a specialist. Not so very long ago the general practitioner looked upon his patient as his private property, and trespassers were warned off with all the terrors of exposure in the pillory of the medical journals. He now feels that his position has lost something of its security, for he knows that if his patient does not rapidly mend inquiry will be made for the name and address of the greatest authority on the disease in question, to whose care his patient will straightway commit himself. The family doctor thus comes to look on the specialist as a receiver of stolen goods, if not as the actual thief. The latter, on the other hand, is often placed in a difficult position, for if any special treatment is required, it is too likely that the general practitioner will not be competent to carry it out, whilst if the specialist retains the patient under his own immediate care he is open to misconception of a kind that is peculiarly galling to an honourable man.

The opposition to specialism in medicine is the more curious because, so far as I know, no ignominy or discredit has ever been supposed to attach to specialists in any other profession. The practice of the law is more highly specialised than that of medicine, yet no objection has ever been raised either on the part of the legal profession or the public to this subdivision of labour; and though no doubt a Chancery barrister thinks himself a little above an Old Bailey practitioner, yet the specialist practising at the Parliamentary bar, or in the Probate, Divorce, Admiralty, or Ecclesiastical Courts, and those confining themselves to Bankruptcy or to Patents, all hold an equally good professional position. Again, surely painters are not despised who, desiring excellence in one thing more worthy of attainment than mediocrity in many, give themselves entirely to one line of work, training their eyes to see and their hands to limn every smallest detail within their chosen range. Has Cooper been jeered at for spending his days in the sole endeavour to paint cattle supremely well? Was Landseer scorned because his brush was wholly given up

to the forms and attitudes, the virtues and vices of our "poor relations"? Does the Academy close its august portals to those who confine themselves to landscape, or sea, or the human form divine? To take even an extreme instance of specialism, who shall say that Canaletto wasted his powers in the utter devotion of them to the palace walls and watery thoroughfares of Venice? The engineering profession is of comparatively modern growth as regards many departments, yet putting aside military, naval, and civil engineers, there are mechanical, mining, hydraulic, submarine, railway, electrical, gas, and sanitary specialists, and this classification is far from being exhaustive. Engineers have to deal with inert matter which can be accurately weighed and measured, not with "vital forces," and the uncertain quantities connected with physiological and pathological conditions. It might therefore be thought that so great a multiplication of specialties was in this instance unnecessary, if not actually inconvenient. Experience, however, has proved the contrary. The tendency, indeed, is towards the still further division of each of the great branches of engineering, and this is felt by practical men to be inevitable; so far, indeed, from specialists being ostracised, they are encouraged to perfect their work by limiting its range.

After all, whatever be the result to the medical profession, there can be no doubt that the existence of specialism is a distinct advantage to the public. The laity, which does not concern itself about the internal dissensions of the medical body, and which has never treated even the decencies of orthodox medicine with more than modified respect, was not long in settling the question for itself. Approaching the matter as it did from a mere business point of view, the decision could not be doubtful. It was obvious that a man who gave himself wholly up to doing one thing thoroughly well was more likely to be successful in his aim than persons of wider range but less concentration. When the general opinion on the subject became too clear for even the dullest to misapprehend, medical men found themselves obliged to look at specialism from a different standpoint, and in self-defence to establish a *modus vivendi* with it. The necessity of specialism in medicine may now be said to have been universally ratified by the profession, at large by the institution of the International Congresses which have been held in recent years. These meetings are almost entirely based on the idea of subdivision of labour which is the great principle underlying specialism, so that they constitute at once a formal recognition and a gigantic concrete example of it. It was not, however, till the last Congress (Copenhagen, 1884) that the existing specialties were fully represented each in an independent section. The programme of the London Congress (1881) was disfigured by an act of petty jealousy which at one time threatened to create a small schism. Only those behind the scenes know

the heartburnings and intrigues and all the arts of diplomatic finesse that were required to wring even partial recognition from the stage managers of that most successful "show." If the plain unvarnished tale of this story in a teatime could ever be unfolded to the public how greatly would the revelation add to the respect in which our noble profession is held.

But it may be asked, What is this "monster of such fearful mien," that has excited such unholy wrath where the Olympian serenity of science should reign undisturbed? Is it, to speak plainly, a system of downright imposture, a "charlatan" in short, or a super-subtle refinement of half-conscious quackery? A short cut to fame and fortune without too nice regard to the cleanness of the road? Or to be more charitable, is it, however honest, a delusion and a snare, an unnecessary overgrowth of our somewhat rankly luxuriant civilization or at best a necessary evil? Now it may be as well for me to say here that in upholding *specialism* it is no part of my thesis that *specialists* must individually be immaculate any more than that every one of them must possess the highest skill. There are black sheep in every fold, and a man may make a medical speciality a means of fraud as easily as he can pretend to cure all diseases. Unscrupulous opponents have no doubt tried to establish in the public mind an association between specialism and humbug, and they have been careful to guard themselves from retort by declaring that their blows were aimed not at the thing but at its abuse. I have no desire to question the good faith of these righteous persons, but like the bear in the fable they crush the head of specialism in their eagerness to destroy a fly on its face. They involve the system itself and the just men who honestly practise it in the assault which they profess to direct solely against the sinners who trade on it. I am inclined to think, however, that it is not so much in special fields of practice that charlatanism flourishes most abundantly as in the vaguer and more nebulous region of "pure" physics, where plausible theories are less easy of disproof and the consequences of treatment can less readily be traced. Hence it is among general physicians rather than among specialists that assumed airs of dignity take the place of the careful investigation of symptoms, and oracular sententiousness does duty for technical skill.

I am now prepared to the main argument of my paper, and in discussing the nature of specialism it will be easy to show that in many cases where from being an evil it is a distinct good, and that while it is necessary in some branches, it is under certain conditions dangerous in all. Specialism is simply a recognition of the natural limitation of the powers of the human mind and a deliberate concentration of a man's best powers on a single object. Thus stated, it would seem to be a mere truism to say that specialism is necessary

for work to be effectual, and indeed this is accepted as an axiom in every other department of knowledge. In science and even in literature the mere accumulation of facts is so colossal that no single mind can hold anything but comparatively small fragments of the whole. The encyclopædic erudition of the Scaligers and Casaubons of a bygone age is altogether impossible to modern scholars; a scientific man who nowadays should, like Bacon, "take all learning to be his province" would be in danger of being sent to associate with kindred enthusiasts in Bedlam. Nowhere is the change more evident than in medicine. Physicians of the present day read with a feeling of half-amused wonder the mere list of Boerhaave's writings, which include essays *de omni scibili* in medical and natural science, and marvel at the complex talent of Haller, who embodied in his own single person a fairly complete professorial staff, besides being an accomplished linguist and a poet above mediocrity. Such leviathans of omniscience loom dim and gigantic through the vista of the past like the megatherium and mastodon of remote geological periods, and the type is as utterly extinct. In fact the *Zeitgeist* looks with suspicion on universal learning, and inclines to believe that the soundness of a man's knowledge is in the inverse ratio of its extent. Whoso, indeed, is not a specialist is at once set down as a dilettante. No one comparing the present race of physicians with those of a time not so very remote can fail to observe a remarkable dissimilarity, less from a strictly professional point of view, than from the difference in their mental equipment. The older physicians were usually the foremost representatives of the best and widest culture of their time. At once scholars and men of science, they commanded respect more by the vastness of their erudition than, it must be confessed, by the results of their practical skill. They were often distinguished in literature. Arbuthnot and Garth could associate with the wits of their day without any sense of inferiority as regards culture. Our latter-day doctors have altogether lapsed from the category of scholars; they are now probably the least learned of the three liberal professions. Even as men of science we are no longer up to the level of our predecessors. The branches of knowledge which were formerly considered as ancillary to medicine are now on an altogether independent footing, and have even in a few instances renounced their allegiance to their former mistress. There are now anatomists and physiologists who have never set foot within the walls of a hospital, whilst, on the other hand, a knowledge of chemistry is deemed by many a superfluous accomplishment in a physician.

The development and expansion of medicine and the cognate sciences during the last half-century have probably been greater than in all the previous ages of the world's history, and the mass is every

SPECIALISM IN MEDICINE.

day growing larger and more unwieldy. Under these circumstances specialism is simply unavoidable, unless "a little learning" is to become the rule. No one, I imagine, can seriously maintain the contrary. If, as already shown, specialism is found necessary in the purely mechanical arts, *a fortiori* the infinitely more intricate problems of medical science, dealing as they do with organic matter in its most complex development, can be thoroughly investigated only by a system of minute subdivision of labour. Take for example the single subject of diseases of the throat. The scientific literature relating to these dates from little more than twenty-five years back, and already it has grown to a bulk that would surfeit the voracity of the most persevering bookworm; and it goes on increasing and multiplying in a manner that makes one long for a Malthus to preach some degree of moderation to its producers. Every week, every day brings me books, pamphlets, articles, lectures, reprints about all sorts of uncomfortable things in *itis* and *osis*, as seen in the throats of Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Italians, Danes, Russians, Americans, and all the other offspring of Babel. A certain proportion of these, no doubt, are of great value, but not a few might be consigned to the waste-paper basket without serious loss to science; all must be read, however, lest some grains of wheat should be thrown away with the chaff. Several periodicals dealing exclusively with diseases of the throat appear with praiseworthy regularity; and there are also societies, associations, &c., founded for the same purpose, each of which, of course, issues its yearly volume of transactions. All this makes up a solid mass of literary material the mere reading of which would fully employ all one man's time; to those who have other engagements the task is simply impossible. Abstracts of the more important papers are humanely furnished from time to time by the journals; but even with this help the burden is a heavy one for the strongest shoulders. This may give some faint idea of the Herculean labour which the specialist who wishes to keep abreast of the progress of knowledge in his own subject from the literary point of view alone has to undergo; and it must be remembered that in medicine reading is, after all, only subsidiary to the practical work by which skill is perfected and experience gathered and extended. Multiply the literary production of this one speciality by fifteen, the number of sections into which the London Medical Congress was divided (and even these do not adequately represent the full degree of specialisation which medicine has now reached), and it will be conceded by the most bigoted anti-specialist that not only the natural limitation of each man's capacity but the elementary question of time makes it impossible for the conscientious worker to be other than a specialist.

It is clear that if specialism in knowledge has become the rule in

medicine, specialism in practice must follow as a necessary corollary. In dealing with disease two things are requisite, diagnosis and treatment, that is to say, recognition of the nature of the evil and the selection and right use of remedies to overcome it. I say advisedly "selection and right use," because it is one thing to know what ought to be done, and quite another thing to be able to do it. Now diagnosis and treatment are just the points in which the healing art has made most progress in modern times, this advance being chiefly owing to the invention of "instruments of precision," whereby parts of the body formerly as inaccessible to our senses during life as the centre of the earth can be accurately explored and subjected to direct treatment. Many of these mechanical aids are of complicated structure, and all of them require much practice before they can be used with ease and accuracy. Now life being, as Hippocrates said, "short," whilst "art is long," and is daily growing longer, in other words, more difficult to acquire, it is obvious that it is utterly impossible for one man to be equally skilled in all the departments of practical medicine. The mere enumeration of such things as the stethoscope, the ophthalmoscope, the laryngoscope, the microscope, the pleximeter, the cardiograph, the sphygmograph, the spirometer, to say nothing of the various electrical instruments, is sufficient to strike dismay into the most resolute heart. * In general practice, no doubt, some of these aids can be and are dispensed with, but in cases which present any special difficulty the proper means of diagnosis must be employed or justice will not have been done to the patient.

The conclusion is absolutely inevitable that from the mere force of circumstances there must be specialists, i.e. men who by concentration of effort and larger opportunities of practice have acquired more than ordinary skill in one particular line. The Father of Medicine, himself the model and exemplar of general physicians, and a man of the most philosophic breadth of mind, acknowledged the necessity of specialists in at least one branch of practice requiring more than ordinary skill. In the oath which his disciples had to take before they were admitted to practise there was a clause whereby they bound themselves to leave a certain operation in the hands of those who had acquired special dexterity in its performance. Whilst referring to ancient times, it may not be superfluous to remind the reader that the most scientific of all the nations of antiquity—the Egyptians—had their medical organization based entirely on specialism. "So wisely," says Herodotus, "was medicine managed by them that no doctor was permitted to practise any but his own peculiar branch. Some were oculists, who only studied diseases of the eye; others attended solely to complaints of the head; others to those of the teeth; some, again, confined themselves to complaints of the intestines, and others to secret and internal maladies." We have

unfortunately no evidence, statistical or other, of the practical results of this system. Probably, however, they were as good, that is to say, as indifferent, as those which our modern general hospitals have to show.

The test of actual result is the only sure one in a subject so essentially practical as medicine. A few remarks must, however, be made on certain features of specialism in general which are often made the grounds of condemnation by its antagonists. Those "superior persons" talk of cramping and distortion of the intelligence as likely to result from its being always confined within a narrow range; of impairment of the mental vision as necessarily resulting from too close and too prolonged direction to one object; and even of the mind becoming the prey of its habitual occupation so that its whole outlook is finally coloured thereby. The man, in fact, after riding his hobby to the death, is in turn ridden by it to the disturbance of his mental equilibrium. There is not the slightest doubt that these dangers are far from being imaginary; the various tendencies just indicated have been the sport of satirists since the "wise man" of old who fell into the water whilst absorbed in the study of the stars. Such evil effects, however, are not by any means necessary consequences of exclusive devotion to a single subject. To take the alleged drawbacks seriatim. The "cramping" effect of specialism may easily be exaggerated. If the mind is narrowed thereby, may it not be said that what it loses in breadth it gains in depth? And after all is not this contraction better than the dilution or rather super-saturation of the mind that results from trying to absorb too much. It is a physiological truth that regular exercise strengthens not only the particular set of muscles called into play, but to a certain extent the whole muscular system. In like manner active use of the mental faculties even if only in one direction must in some measure tend to invigorate the intellect as a whole. The fact is that in medicine more than in most other branches of science the various parts are bound together in such close interdependence that it is impossible to understand one fact or one order of facts, i.e. know it in all its connotations, without a wide though possibly superficial acquaintance with the whole surrounding body of related facts. For this reason "cramping" of the mind is less likely to result from specialisation in medicine than in simpler subjects of study. On the contrary, I maintain that a healthy specialism affords the mental powers the best mode of fruitful exercise. Moreover, it may be the duty of a man to run the risk, such as it is, of "cramping" his mind. Should not one suffer for the good of many? The specialist so amusingly described by Oliver Wendell Holmes, who could not pretend to the title of "entomologist" or even of "coleopterist," but humbly contented himself with the name of "scarabceist," would be sneered at by many

self-styled philosophers as narrow; but can it be denied that though stunting their own intellectual stature such single-minded enthusiasts enlarge the boundaries of science? By an excessive use of the microscope the eyesight may be impaired or even destroyed, but who will revile the worker whose personal loss is the general gain? Every profession has its own special bane for the mind, and many industries leave their mark—often a fatal one—on the body. These dangers, however, must be encountered unless the world is to come to a standstill. If the workers suffer in mind or body from their occupation, should they not be regarded as heroes and martyrs rather than as fit objects for contempt or hatred? A specialist whose mind has become cramped from over-devotion to a useful pursuit should be looked upon with the same respect as a veteran who has lost a leg or an arm in fighting the battles of his country.

If cramping may be considered as the first degree of injury caused by specialism, the blindness to everything outside the narrow circle of one's own work may justly be called the second. This mole-like type of specialism is only an exaggeration of the first, and need not be more fully discussed. The third degree, which, again, is only the second pushed to its complete development, is of a more important type than the others, and it may in fact amount to monomania. When a man's intellect is "subdued to what it works in like the dyer's hand," he has reached a stage of mental deterioration in which he is unfit even for the cultivation of his own speciality. In the field of abstract science this surrender of his whole being to his study can lead to nothing worse than eccentricity. The chemist in Balzac's *Recherche de l'Absolu*, who analyses the tears of his despairing wife, and the pedant who, whilst allowing that Frederick the Great might be a man of some practical ability, gravely doubted whether he could successfully conjugate a verb in μ , are examples of this crystallisation of the mind round one object. In the sphere of medical practice, however, such men may be positively mischievous, if not dangerous. Whether it be the "mad doctor" who considers nobody quite *compos mentis*, or the physician who traces every ailment to gout or "liver," and treats it in the light of his theory, or the surgeon who thinks the nose the "hub" of the human microcosm, and therefore the proper object of attack in most diseases, a man possessed by a tyrannous *idée fixe* of any kind is not a safe guide. Or, to take less flagrant instances, by keeping only one particular end in view, the specialist may sometimes be led to over frequent or too prolonged local medication—a course of action which is often attributed to a less worthy motive. In connection with this subject I may perhaps be allowed to say that there is often much misapprehension; not only in the lay mind, but even amongst general practitioners, otherwise intelligent and well informed. Speaking from a not inconsiderable experience in my

own particular line, I am disposed to affirm that even among specialists the importance of adequate local treatment is perhaps not always fully appreciated; at any rate, the conviction, if held, is not sufficiently acted upon. It is, however, an undeniable fact that those specialists are the most successful in their treatment who recognise the great principle that in a large number of chronic diseases local medication to be effectual must be persevering and gradual in proportion to the length of time that the morbid process has been going on. Nevertheless this doctrine does not commend itself either to the sufferer, impatient to get well, and expecting to be cured by some physical equivalent to the "Hey presto" formula, nor to the general practitioner, who looks with natural and honest suspicion on any mode of treatment which acts as a derivative of fees from his own pocket. Both are apt to call loudly for more heroic measures; they will have no nonsense! They want something done, and quickly, or the patient will go elsewhere. Now this is not quite fair either to the specialist or to the patient. The belief in remedial agents that shall at once remove conditions which may have been in course of development for years indicates the survival of a barbarous superstition, and is no doubt founded on the ignorant view that every disease is a definite material entity to be cast out like a devil-in-possession by the exorcism of some potent drug. The careful observer, however, soon finds that he gains nothing, but rather loses ground, by too energetic measures, that the real principle of cure is expressed in the words of the poet, *Gutta curat lapidem non vi sed sapientia cadendo*, and that any attempt to hasten the process is almost sure to end in failure.

In fairly well-balanced minds there is little fear of complete absorption. By one subject especially if a groundwork of broad general culture underlies the speciality. No medical specialist is to be trusted who has not received the best and widest education in medicine and surgery, and they undoubtedly make the best specialists who, either as physicians or surgeons at general hospitals or as family practitioners, have had the largest and most varied preliminary experience. If, under these advantageous circumstances, the change be not made too late in life, all previous work can be brought to a focus on one special point. Specialism of this sort, once fairly looked in the face and stripped of its imaginary horrors, cannot, I feel sure, excite anything but respect in the most conservative breast. However this may be, it is certain that specialism must become more and more developed in proportion to the advance of medical knowledge. We have evidence before our eyes that the process is actually going on. The present divisions are beginning to be still further subdivided. Thus ophthalmic surgery already comprises two if not three different specialities within itself: the purely operative depart-

ment, the purely optical (more readily intelligible to the popular mind as that which deals with "glasses"), and lastly what may be called the "general practice" of the eye. Obstetric medicine has divided itself into two main branches, namely, that from which it derives its appellation, and that which concerns the diseases peculiar to women. The latter again is subdivided into smaller segments. One most justly celebrated man may almost be said to have confined himself to the practice of a single operation, the details and results of which he has been able by this concentration of energy to bring as near perfection as human fallibility permits. Need I say that at the outset of his career professional Podsnaps were as eager to "put down" this benefactor of the human race as they now are to swell the chorus of praise which the mention of his name everywhere calls forth?

It is easy to foresee that according to the laws of evolution the "pure" physician will in time disappear, leaving only the general practitioner and the specialist. The time, indeed, is fast approaching when every physician will have to justify his existence by the possession real or supposed of pre-eminent talent in some one direction. The public is waking up to the fact that the many-sided man is apt to be untrustworthy at least in the realm of practice. It is not meant to imply that a "good all round man" can ever be useless, but his domain is in the region of family practice. The vast improvement that has taken place in the whole scheme of medical education has made the general practitioner of the present day quite a different person from the "surgeon and apothecary" of the Bob Sawyer period. The level of professional knowledge and skill is in every way much higher than before, especially among the men who have left the schools during the last fifteen or twenty years. This of itself tends to make the consultant who is not a specialist a superfluity. The opinion of a "pure" physician is in fact grounded on a basis of attainments essentially similar in kind to that of the well-informed general practitioner, however it may surpass it in degree. What is wanted, however, in really difficult cases is the assistance of a trained expert, and this can only be supplied by a specialist. The very *raison d'être* of the consultant as such is that he is presumed to have some special skill to which men of less experience cannot attain. With the boundaries of our knowledge widening out in every direction with the rapidity now seen, the conscientious worker will find it hard enough to cultivate adequately even one small corner. The "family doctor" will pursue the even tenour of his way, attending his patients in their progress through most of the seven stages of life, and so getting to know the peculiarities of their constitutions as no specialist ever can. When special need arises special help will be called in, but the specialist can never supplant the general practi-

tioner. The one is simply complementary to the other. Whether we shall ever advance so far in the subdivision of labour as to have no doctors at all but such as are specialists, or whether such a state of things would be desirable, need not be discussed here.

When the worst has been said against specialism, it still remains as a system of work which, if narrow and comparatively humble in its aim, is practically more successful in attaining it than broader and more philosophical methods. The final test of every institution as of every individual in these days is the record of actual achievement which it has to show. Judged by the standard of results, whether in the shape of additions to the store of scientific truths or to the armoury of weapons against disease, specialism has nothing to fear. Even its enemies must admit that it is to it that the vast strides which the art of healing has taken in late years are mainly due, and there can be no doubt that medicine can only continue to advance by a process of specialisation becoming more and more minute. In the eyes of *idéologues* whose breadth of view rather impairs the keenness of their vision of things close at hand, the specialist no doubt may appear a somewhat unheroic figure beside his larger-minded brethren. Practical men, however, consider less the intrinsic nobility of the work than the efficiency with which it is done. It has been shown that in the present stage of development of medical science the pretence of universal attainment is more trifling. The question, in short, between the specialist and the general physician is a simple one: By which is the largest measure of relief given to the patients under his care? The answer cannot I think be doubtful; indeed it has been given with no uncertain sound by the sufferers themselves. Not that I would be thought to disparage for a moment wide culture and philosophical largeness of view, in medicine as in other things these rare and admirable qualities have their place. That place, however, is the professor's chair rather than the patient's bedside. The ambition of the general physician is no doubt high and noble, though his effect is too often small; the specialist may justly claim that his object, if less ambitious, is more definite and attainable.

"This low man seeks a little thing to do,
Sees it and does it:
 That high man with a great thing to pursue
Dies ere he knows it."

MORELL MACKENZIE.

WYCLIF AND THE BIBLE.

THE attention recently called to the great Reformer of the fourteenth century will be legitimately revived by the appearance of the revised edition of the Bible. It will not therefore be inappropriate to endeavour upon this occasion to grasp the fundamental elements of his character and the guiding principles of his life, as well as to determine the most important lessons which he left behind him, both for his own and succeeding times. Wyclif's extraordinary abilities were fully acknowledged during his lifetime, and have never been disputed. He was not merely a theologian, but was widely acquainted with the science of his day. He was familiar with what had been done in mathematics, chemistry, optics, and natural history; and the effect was not only to widen the field of his mental vision, but to supply him, in lectures, sermons, and published treatises, with illustrations which lent vivacity to his reasonings, and brought them into closer contact with the every-day life of man. In his own more peculiar field, again, of scholastic disputation, he was an unquestioned master. Even his bitterest enemies magnified the extent of his learning, the subtlety of his intellect, and the keenness of his insight. Professor Shirley ranks him with Duns Scotus, Ockham, and Bradwardine, as one of the four great schoolmen of the fourteenth century.¹ He was a diligent student of the fathers without being a slavish follower of their opinions. He thought and spoke for himself. That in doing so he laboured under the disadvantages of the scholastic method, is true. He could not entirely separate himself from the traditions of centuries. Had he broken with these he would not have effected what he did. But it is something to be able to say of him that, if he still adheres in no small degree to the dry disquisitions, the trifling distinctions, and the wearisome repetitions of the schools, no man did more to introduce a brighter sunshine and a healthier atmosphere into the modes of thought and exposition which had ruled till his time with almost undisputed sway. Another point ought to be noticed which admits of no dispute—the purity of his life. His worst foes never breathed suspicion against him upon that score. At a time when the morals of the clergy were far from correct, he was not only unstained by reproach, but noted for his austere and blameless walk. This high tone of life was in full correspondence with his exalted conception of the moral character of Christianity. He felt strongly, too, the responsibility attaching to his own position as a priest.

(1) *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. li.

By nothing, however, was he in all probability so much fitted for his work as by the deliberate and exhaustive manner in which he first surveyed his ground, and then by the coolness, not less than the resoluteness, with which he occupied it. In this respect he differed essentially from Luther, and the difference must be kept in view when we weigh the nature of the results achieved by them. Luther, no doubt, possessed many advantages which did not fall to the lot of his predecessor. The revival of learning had taken place. The mind of Europe had been expanded by contact with the treasures of ancient literature poured into it after the fall of Constantinople. The laity felt their power. Scholasticism had declined, and the printing-press had been invented. Yet the main difference between the work of the two men does not lie in these things. It lies rather in the men themselves, and in their personal experiences. Luther was from the first quick, emotional, passionate, a child of the people, at every point of his life intensely human. Wyclif was more the scholar, the recluse, the speculator, the calm and diligent investigator. Not that he wanted passion; but passion was in him a hidden fire, great in volume, burning clear, while in Luther it was a furnace, bursting forth into great sheets of flame, and kindling whatever came into contact with it. Luther's work began in the struggles of his own soul with sin, and in the cry for pardon and reconciliation with God; Wyclif's began rather in the region of the intellect, in the assertion of the right to think, and in the claim to investigate truth. Above all, Luther beheld around him only men the victims of superstition, men betrayed in the highest of all relations by the paltriest and most unsatisfying substitutes for true religion, blind guides leading the blind in matters of eternal moment, and both falling into the pit of spiritual darkness and despair. Wyclif, in at least the most active period of his life, beheld around him not simply men but fellow-countrymen, oppressed by a foreign yoke, and handed over to a distant and tyrannous power by those who ought to have been the guardians of their liberties and the protectors of their national birthright. It may be doubted if the later Reformer had much of the idea of country in his mind at all. Certainly he had no traditions to make his soul burn or his eye flash when foreign hands were laid upon the wealth of his native soil, or when efforts were made to silence the voice of her people's parliaments for the sake of a corrupt court and dissolute nobles. The earlier Reformer had the traditions of a little island where the winds had been always free, and where the waves, as they dashed upon its rock-bound coast, had long been answered by a like stirring spirit in its people. Such things made a great difference between the two Reformers, and must be taken into account when we think either of their personality or of their works.

In the meantime, however, we have to do with Wyclif; and the

most interesting question that meets us in connection with him has reference to the fundamental, the guiding principle of his life and work. The natural qualities of his character, admirable as they were, were after all no more than the formal preparation of the man or the instruments he was to use. Something more was needed to be his real preparation, the determining principle of his course of action, the power by which the whole machinery of his nature was to be put in motion. In this respect he has been too often thought of mainly as the Englishman; as the patriot interested in the liberties of his country; as the civil rather than as the religious reformer. It is not unnatural that such a view should be entertained, for it was in this capacity that he made his first entrance upon public life; and during the greater part of his after career he was closely associated with all those movements, of his time in which his country vindicated her independence of a foreign yoke. But when we look more closely into the matter, we shall find that religious principles and religious aims did far more to determine what he was than the aspirations of a merely patriotic heart. It was these that made him what he was. His Christianity was the root of his patriotism, not his patriotism the root of his Christianity. In his religious and Christian convictions reached and, except in the extent of their application, matured during the years of his Oxford training previous to A.D. 1366, lay the seed of the plant that was afterwards to bear so large and ripe a crop of fruit. No one will deny that that seed was the Scriptures, or that from the very beginning of his studies he must have been drawn to them, and must have found in them both the nourishment of his own spiritual life and the treasure on which he drew for others. Except on this supposition it is impossible to explain the singular degree to which he identified himself with them, the strength of language with which he recognises their authority, the minute acquaintance with them which appears in all his writings, or the title which he received of the "Evangelical Doctor," which then meant the doctor devoted to the Scriptures in contrast with all other teaching.

It is not enough, however, to say this. The point upon which we desire at present especially to dwell, and in which we seem to find a key to Wyclif's life that has not yet been used, is, that in his study of Scripture he would seem to have come powerfully under the influence of the writings of St. John. He quotes him often, and Dr. Lechler tells us that again and again in his *Dialogue* and other works he refers to John i. 3, 4, as if it were the germ of all his views. Strangely enough Dr. Lechler thinks that he misunderstood the passage, and that the words will not bear the rendering that he gave them. In both the authorised and revised versions the translation, with an unimportant difference, is as follows:—"And without Him was not anything made that hath been made. In Him was life,

and the life was the light of men." Wyclif connects the clauses differently, and translates: "And without Him was not anything made. That which hath been made was life in Him; and the life was the light of men."

But Wyclif is right. He has followed the early fathers, and has apprehended the real meaning of the words. What St. John tells us is, that the Eternal Word was life, life absolutely, and therefore life that could communicate itself; that He was the fountain of all life; and that in Him principally was the life of every creature before it was called into existence. The teaching will be better understood if we compare the words of the Gospel with those of the song of the four-and-twenty elders in the Apocalypse: "Worthy art Thou, our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honour and the power; for Thou hast created all things, and because of Thy will they were, and they were created." All things *were* before they were created. In other words, it is St. John's principle appearing alike in the fourth Gospel and in the Apocalypse, that in God, and, if in God, therefore also in that Word to whom the Father, who hath life in Himself gave to have life in Himself,¹ there is an eternal pattern of all things that are realised on earth. By this pattern must all things on earth be judged, and to it all of them must, as far as possible, be conformed. This is the idealism of St. John, and Wyclif caught the inspiration.

Here, then, we seem to obtain the key to most at least of what Wyclif both was and did—to his philosophical system; his work as a reformer of ecclesiastical abuses; his views on property, so often misunderstood and harshly judged; and even to his *method* of reasoning upon any point he had in hand.

Let us look for a moment at the last point first, and the Reformer's idealism at once explains to us why he should always, in reasoning, go back to first principles. It is often in no small degree burdensome to the reader to find the commonest question discussed from the most remote and far-drawn considerations as to the nature of God and the eternal relations existing between Him and His creatures? But how can Wyclif argue otherwise? He can only deal with existing things by comparing them with the pattern in the Mount. He must reach that "one first" which is the measure of all others.² Let us turn to his philosophy. It is well known that he was a Realist, and this harmonises exactly with what has been said, for the Realists, as distinguished from the Nominalists, believed that generals or universals have an existence prior to, and independent of, the individual objects to which they relate. In the words of the scholastic philosophy they were *universalia ante rem*.

(1) John v. 26.

(2) The following words are quoted by Dr. Lechler from a Vienna MS. :—"In omni genere est unum primum quod est metrum et mensura ceterum aliorum," vol. i. p. 472, note 1.

But, above all, it was this same lofty idealism that lay at the bottom of Wyclif's career as a reformer of ecclesiastical abuses. His conception of the Church of Christ, gathered from Scripture, was essentially ideal. In almost every important particular it was directly the opposite of what he beheld around him. An outward and carnal institution had taken the place of the spiritual kingdom which Christ had founded. Even within this institution the clergy alone were regarded as the Church, the possessors of all her power, and the dispensers of all her privileges. The people were entirely in their hands, with no independent standing, no right of free access to the Father of their spirits, and no responsibility except that of obedience to ecclesiastical superiors who, even in the most favourable circumstances, treated them as children. Let us not blame the spiritual rulers of that day too much as if nothing of the kind could occur again.* The evil sprang from deeper than Romanist roots, from roots which will probably never be eradicated while human nature is what it is. Nay, it is often the ablest and best men who are in danger of being the first to yield to it. Their own motives are pure: they know how they will use the influence they may acquire. They have such a vision of the glory of their beneficent work that they cannot believe in the existence of worldly ecclesiastics who will not be lightened and elevated by the same glory. Would that experience confirmed the justness of their expectation! There can be no nobler thought than that of upholding, vindicating, strengthening the Church of Christ, when the true idea of that Church is preserved—the idea of service, toil, suffering for the sake of Christ's body and of mankind. There can be none more disastrous when there is substituted for this the thought of a great hierarchy with power, riches, splendour, and worldly pomp. Men say, You gain the world in this way; we say, No, you lose the Church. Thus Wyclif felt, and far more interesting, accordingly, in this point of view than any, even the most memorable, of his overt acts, is the principle upon which he proceeded. That principle reminds us again of the writings of "the beloved disciple," and confirms what has been said as to the Johannine idealism which lay at the bottom of all the Reformer's views and movements. Wyclif drew a distinction between the Church and the elect within the Church. He recognised the fact that false members must be included in the former. He proceeded upon the principles involved in our Lord's own parable of the vine, when, saying of Himself, I am the true Vine, Jesus immediately spoke, not only of fruit-bearing branches, but of branches that bear no fruit, that must be taken away, "and men gather them and cast them into the fire and they are burned." Still, these branches were a part of the Vine, a part of the body of Christ, a part of that visible Church which, though by reason of their presence imperfect, was yet struggling towards perfection. The

elect, however, within the outward Church were the true kernel; all of them, without distinction of clergy and laity, priests unto God and the Father, admitted to the same privileges, summoned to the same life, bound, except in so far as God had otherwise appointed, to the same duties.

The distinction thus drawn by Wyclif is not the same as that drawn by the later Reformers between the visible and the invisible Church, while it is possessed of infinitely more practical power. According to the later view the *invisible* Church is the body of Christ, and it cannot be sought on earth, for it consists of "the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be." The visible Church, on the other hand, consists of all who upon earth "profess the true religion." Our thoughts are thus divided between what is ideal but cannot be realised on earth, and what is realised on earth but must always be actual, not ideal. Our aspirations are transferred from earth to heaven, and we need not strive after the ideal here, because we cannot reach it here. There is upon this view, strictly speaking, no body of Christ upon earth at all, but only an institution, a family, a house, or rather many institutions, families, houses, in which we are trained to be members of that body. Wyclif's view again fastens our attention upon something which exists within the outward Church, which is ideally perfect, which is therefore entitled to our first regard, which shows us what the whole Church ought to be, and which, because it is ideal, must supply a standard of attainment to everything occupying a lower ground. Were one to follow out the thought he would perhaps say that the body of Christ is here, in the form of the outward professing Church, and that, like Christ's own earthly body, it is dwelt in by the spirit which is yet to pervade it wholly and to transfuse it wholly into a spiritual body when the appointed moment comes. Any way, the main point is this, that there is a truly ideal element within the present outward framework, that there is a Church in the highest sense within the Church in a lower sense, and that upon this, and not upon a distinction between the visible and the invisible Church we are to fix our thoughts. The one may, indeed, although in a different way, be as visible as the other.

Such was the principle, and a consequence of great logical importance flowed from it upon which Wyclif must have more or less acted whether he presented it clearly to his own mind or not. In looking upon the outward and professing Church as the body of Christ, it was of course possible to think only of Christ in His state of humiliation. The visible and professing body was not perfect enough to be identified with Christ in any higher state. But if so, it naturally followed that the inner circle of believers, the essence of the Church, those from whom we learn what the Church should be, were to be identified

‘with the glorified Redeemèr,’ with the Redeemer who had surmounted all imperfection and limitation, and who now, clothed with His “spiritual body,” was complete. That thought cut in an instant at the root of all the secularisation and worldliness of the Church. What pretensions could she have to earthly honour and dignity, whose duty it was to take her Master’s place in the world and do His work? What desires could she have for them, the distinguishing characteristic of whose position was that she was already passing out of the region of earthly, and was seated in the region of heavenly things? Her pretensions could only be to a cross, to more toil than other men, to more suffering than other men, to self-denial and self-sacrifice, to do good which would be unrewarded here, to rest which would be found only on the other side of the grave. Her desires could only be that she might walk more worthily of her ideal standing in the heavenly places. In proceeding upon these principles the great Reformer of the fourteenth century laid down lines which even the Reformers of the sixteenth century did not see with equal clearness, and which are not fully comprehended to this day.

Out of this ideal view of what the Church of Christ was all Wyclif’s efforts as a Reformer flowed. It was thus that, negatively, he set himself with so much determination against the worldliness, pride, luxury, and selfish ease of the prelates and priests of his time. He went back to the early Church. He contrasted in a thousand ways the condition of our Lord and His apostles with that of those around him who arrogated to themselves the name of the Church. He attacked them with reproach, scorn, indignation, with every species of invective. And yet through all, the reader is chiefly overpowered, as he is overpowered in St. John, with the wail of melancholy. It is the thought of Christ’s little flock untended, uncared for, that rends his heart, and that dictates these passionate appeals to the Almighty, to the God of holiness and mercy. Nor was it otherwise with his efforts after positive reformation, with his attack upon the citadel of Romish error, the doctrine of transubstantiation, with his devotion to preaching, with his institution of “poor priests,” and with his translation of the Bible into the tongue of the people. Upon these things individually it is not necessary to dwell. Enough to observe that all of them may be traced to the operation of the same great principle, of the same ideal view of the position and privileges of the true members of Christ’s Church on earth. Nor need it in the least degree surprise us that, while himself retaining his living at Lutterworth, he sent forth his itinerant preachers without gold or silver or brass in their purses, believing that the labourer would be found worthy of his food. He was trying the ideal system which he discovered in the New Testament, but it was by no means necessary on that account to do away with the existing system either of parishes

or of parish tithes. The functions of the two sets of preachers, the parochial and the itinerant, were indeed entirely different. The former were to edify the Church, and to administer her ordinances for the sake of an already believing flock. The latter were to awaken the careless, to reclaim wanderers, and to convert the unbelieving. In his relation to the two classes, therefore, the labourer might well be sustained in wholly different ways. No one will deny that the ideal system upon which the Saviour sent forth His disciples to preach would lend to the Church enormous power in dealing with the masses of a nation that have as yet refused to listen to the call of the Gospel. But it by no means follows that where a Christian congregation has been formed the same system is equally important. Wyclif appears to have felt this. He saw no contradiction between drawing the tithes of his own parish and sending out his "poor priests" with nothing to depend on but the alms of those to whom they preached. He even complained at one time (A.D. 1366) that attempts were made to engage him in controversy in order to deprive him of his ecclesiastical benefices;¹ and, although he may have afterwards gone farther in his views, he retained his emoluments at Lutterworth to the last, and no one has ever attempted to charge him with inconsistency.

In all these ecclesiastical and religious movements, then, we appear to trace the working of a high New Testament idealism as the chief guiding principle of Wyclif's life. He has been upon the Mount with God, and his great aim is to find as far as possible practical expression for the pattern that has been shown him there.

But Wyclif's idealism not only explains his work as an ecclesiastical reformer, it goes far also to explain his views on property. Upon this point it is desirable to say a few words, partly because of its immense importance, and partly because Wyclif's position in connection with it has been often misunderstood. Even so eminent an historian as Dr. Stubbs declares that "his logical system of politics applied to practice turns out to be little else than socialism."²

One point seems to be clear. The system must be applied to all property. The attempt has been made, but unsuccessfully, to separate between its application to Church property and to property of other kinds. Wyclif did not hold that every man's private property was his own, but that the Church's property belonged to the State. He applied his principle to the latter; but the principle covered all. That principle is expressed by the celebrated apothegm that "dominion is founded on grace;" and the meaning is that no man, and no body of men, could claim an absolute and inherent right to the goods possessed by them. All things belonged to God, and were granted by Him as fiefs are by a feudal superior. As originally

(1) Vaughan, *Monograph*, p. 108.

(2) *Constitutional History*, vol. ii., p. 440.

bestowed they were forfeited by sin, but were restored by grace or mercy, on conditions opposed to sin, and which sin must again invalidate. It follows as a natural consequence that the man who uses his possessions ill forfeits them in principle, and ought to lose them. The difficulty is of course to find out the point at which the goods are forfeited, and who has a right to take them. Until the treatise in which Wyclif's views are fully explained is published, it is not possible to say precisely how he would have met these difficulties in the case of civil or personal property. We know, however, that he strenuously denied that, upon his principle, a debtor might escape payment of his debt, a tenant of his rent, or a servant of his obligations, whenever these several persons were satisfied that the creditor, the landlord, or the master was a wicked man. We know that he maintained that by the law of God "common men should serve meekly God and their lords, and do true service to God and their masters. By the law of Christ if the lord be an untrue man and tyrant to his subjects they should yet serve him." "Pay to all men debts," he says, "both tribute and custom, and fear, and honour, and love. Our Saviour Jesus Christ suffered meekly a painful death from Pilate; and St. Paul said that he was ready to suffer death by doom of the emperor's justice, if he deserved to die."¹ In such cases he seems to have satisfied himself with the general statement that to property misapplied and abused the owner had no longer a rightful claim.

The case of Church property opened an easier and clearer path to his conclusion. In judging of his argument it is essentially necessary to bear in mind the precise state of matters with which he had to contend. It was urged by his opponents that under no circumstances whatever could either the persons or the property of the clergy be touched by the civil power. Both were sacred. God had granted His Church an indefeasible and inalienable claim to freedom from all interference on the part of the State. The State had no right to touch the persons of churchmen, whatever their deserts, or the property of the Church, however it might be abused. With his keenest irony, therefore, Wyclif showed to what absurdities this contention led. For such abuses there must be a remedy, and the remedy rests upon the principle that dominion, which is distinct from power, is founded on grace. Here, too, he had another advantage, for his principles led him, as we have seen, to maintain that the clergy were not the Church. The whole people of the land, the king, the parliament, and the nation, were as much a part of the Church as the clergy were. For them the clergy existed, not they for the clergy. The latter were not masters; they were ministers or servants for the common good, and all servants must be liable to give an account of

[1] *Pennington's Life of Wyclif*, pp. 75, 76.

their stewardship. Thus looked at, the interference of the State with the property of the Church was not the interference of an extraneous power. The magistrate was the vicar of God,¹ the nation was a Christian nation acting through its natural representatives, who disowned neither their duty nor their responsibility to represent it. It was taking stock of goods which had been bestowed upon it from a divine source, and for divine purposes. The source had been lost sight of. Even in pleading that their dotations were divine the clergy had forgotten what the divine meant. The purposes had been abused; instead of being divine they were become worldly, sensual, devilish. The Christian nation had need to reform itself, and in doing so it was entitled to see that Church property was applied to the Christian objects for which it was intended. All this, it will be seen, was the very reverse of what is nowadays urged as the Voluntary view.

But although Wyclif's path was thus easier in the case of Church than of personal property, his principle really embraced both. What are we to think of it? Professor Shirley has endeavoured to defend it by the consideration that it "was put forth by its author as an ideal, and with the full admission that it was incompatible in many of its results with the existing state of society;"² and Canon Pennington pleads on behalf of the promulgation of it that it was "only a theory."³ Both apologies are unsatisfactory. Ideals may not be capable of being at once reduced to practice, but there is nothing so truly practical as they are. Nor is there anything that a man is less justified in putting forth than a false theory. Both ideals and theories present an end which we are not simply to admire, but towards which we are to work. They contain in them the seeds of an endless growth. Much of Christianity is in the best sense ideal; and because it is so, it is entitled to the admiration of men now, and will command the allegiance of the best of men until they have a higher ideal (and when will that be?) set before them.

The true justification of Wyclif is that his principle is sound. No man has in all circumstances an absolute right to what he has acquired or inherited. Why should we hesitate to say so? Even if we look at the principle in its relation to mere worldly movements it will, perhaps, appear not so absurd or dangerous as we might at first sight suppose. The difficulty of the application may be granted, but upon what other principle shall we justify the expulsion of the Stuarts, the Bourbons, or the Napoleons? We may not always see clearly when to enforce it. The principle is ideal. We are commonly very far

(1) Comp. extracts from the Reformer's works in *Life*, by Vaughan, vol. ii., p. 282, and in *Monograph*, by the same author, p. 450.

(2) *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. lxii.

(3) *Life of Wyclif*, p. 74.

from the ideal. But there come moments in history when, under the pressure of mighty wrongs, the divine righteousness and justice rise before a nation's eyes like a vision of the third heaven. In moments of that kind the nation is in an ideal world; and, under the influence of the ideal, it executes righteousness and justice with a decision and a swiftness of which, when it afterwards returns to its normal state, it can only say that it was then hearing unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. That seems to be the real meaning of Wyclif's principle; and, thus applicable even to personal property, it is more easily applicable to the property of the Church. Wyclif had certainly not the slightest idea of secularising the latter when it was well used. It was never more than "the superfluity of the temporal goods" of the Church that he desired to attain, and his very assertion, that dominion was founded in grace, rendered it necessary to maintain that where this grace was, nothing should be permitted to interfere with the dominion. The principle may come to be needed again; and it will be well that, in any changes that may be before us, it be interpreted in its author's sense, and for such ends as he would have proposed.

We have said enough. It has been no part of our plan to sketch the life of Wyclif, to describe his enormous labours, or to follow him into all those varied spheres of activity in each of which he accomplished enough to make any man famous, though he had done nothing else. We have simply aimed at pointing out a view of the man which has been too little noticed, and which yet seems to supply the real key to all he did. The lesson is an obvious one. We ought to encourage idealism in the Church, and especially in the clergy. Many fear both, and dread—what is by no means impossible even in our day—a return to the old oppression exercised by the clergy over the laity. To counteract this they would lower the conception of the Church's and the minister's work. The true prevention is to heighten both. That is the New Testament plan; and, if the spirit of the New Testament be adhered to, it will be found wise to follow it. Wealth, ease, luxury, pomp, great worldly state, are the very last things to which our Lord or His apostles would have pointed as what ought to characterize the ministry which they founded—the very last, unless there be something still more remote from their thoughts, dominion over the souls of men. The true glory of the ministry does not lie in such things, but in humility, love, self-denial, self-sacrifice, a heavier cross than is given other men to bear, and labours from which there shall be rest only in eternity. That is the Christian ideal; and when the Church strives to realise it in ever-increasing measure, men will have no need to fear her. They will rather encourage her, and say, "While you keep to paths like these we will go with you, for we see that God is with you."

WILLIAM MILLIGAN.

THE SASKATCHEWAN SCARE.

"WHAT we can't understand is how it happens that you have no trouble with your Indians." So spoke many an American official in conversation with Canadians, and the Canadians' reply, "It is because we have always treated the Indian with justice," expressed a fact, for the good policy of the Hudson's Bay Company in their dealings with the savages had been followed. The boast also implied the good intentions of the Government in regard to the future. But the Americans used often to say that the time of trouble might yet come; and it has come, the bolt falling from a sky which seemed serene. The cases of the American and Canadian difficulties are not identical, for in the last the French Metis, or half-breed, has originated and spread the disturbance. He considered that his claims and his position were not sufficiently regarded and recognised, and he has twice caused bloodshed and expense. His case was settled as far as the Province of Manitoba was concerned, by legislation enacted after the expedition led by Lord Wolseley in 1870 had dissipated any armed resistance. The best that can be said of the circumstances of the present "rising" is, that the Saskatchewan Expedition will now settle the question as effectually for the newly opened parts of the country as did the Red River Expedition for Manitoba. Great as is the expense, and grievous as is the loss of many lives, the affair will not be without its good effects. Larger attention will be directed to the country, more vigilance will be employed in the definition of land claims; the supremacy of the Government's allocation of property will be vindicated, and local rights investigated and determined; the settlement of emigrants will for a time become more concentrated, and will fill the lands in the neighbourhood of the railroads, the necessity for which works will have been proved, and their utility will be enhanced by extension. The Indians will find that their best policy is to abide by their agreements with the white man, who is disposed to treat them well, and the transition in their habits will be softened by a generous distribution of food among them, when their necessities are increased by any failure in the crops which they have begun to cultivate under the guidance of white instructors. With the Americans the cause of trouble has been solely the want of honest administration of the Government policy for the management of the Indians; and the Canadians might by their better system have avoided the enmity of all the savage bands as successfully as they have the hostility of most of them, had it not been for the French half-breeds, who in their movement dragged their Indian cousins along with them.

Let us first speak of the Metis and afterwards of the redskin. Voy-

ageurs and trappers, both French and British, have for a century penetrated into the central northern wilds, and as they brought no wives with them, they took unto themselves companions from among the Indians. The French were the first to explore the country, and many of the successful villages and towns now rising in the northwest are built upon the sites of French trading posts or mission stations. To these came also in time the men employed by the North-West Fur Trading Company, or those of the "Merchant Adventurers" of the Hudson Bay Association, recruited in almost all cases from Scotland, and generally from the northern islands, because the men of the mixed Scots and Norse race were found more capable than any of bearing solitude. But they also, being human, appreciated the value of a devoted wife, and have left many descendants. "It is a new and a pleasant experience on entering the house of one of the "factors" of the Hudson's Bay Company, to find a hospitable greeting given to the traveller by a lady who in speech and manner might have been a fresh importation from the Highlands. In appearance, however, she bears the unmistakable impress given by the fine features of the Indian, and she is probably able to converse almost as fluently in the Cree as in the English language. There are many most able and excellent men belonging to the Scots-Indian race, the present Prime Minister of the great and important Province of Manitoba, Mr. Norquay, being himself an example. ~~They are easily to agricultural life, and~~ they are easily to agricultural life, and make fairly good and industrious farmers. They follow the life their fathers lead. It is not always so with the descendants on the Prairies. The influence of the mother is more felt than with the English. The sons of the French voyageurs are more inclined to the restless life of the Indian mother than to the wharfed and settled ways of the "habitant." But there are many, born of a farmer's son, inherit a taste for land cultivation, and whose possessions often reproduce the conditions of agriculture visible in Quebec, where the cultivation is old fashioned and the land is split up into many separate narrow strips, so that each member of the family shall have a small share of the coveted frontage along some river bank. But even where the Metis takes to husbandry he is more closely allied to the Indian than is the English-speaking half-breed. Without inheriting all the Indian dislike of labour he cannot be said to care for work, and the vanity from which perhaps no man is entirely free, is certainly not absent in his case. He is a capital hunter and very fond of the chase. He is an excellent shot, thereby showing his superiority to his redskin cousin, who as a rule is a very bad marksman. His influence with the Indians is great, and there is nothing he likes better than to get away from farm occupation and to lead them on his clever little horse in a buffalo

hunt. Often and often, when the buffalo became scarcer as the hunters increased, has the half-breed joined in the Indian's prayer for food rations to be given by the Government. The answer to this prayer was necessarily: "If you wish for allowances made to Indians, you must be treated as an Indian, go on a reserve of land, become a ward of the State. You can do better than that."

The mention of this brings us at once to the subject of his complaints which have led to the present unfortunate outbreak, and will cost the country very dear, even if the fires of insurrection do not spread among the wild spirits of the Prairie. It may at once be said that most of the Metis' claims were wholly inadmissible. They received too much after the rising at Fort Garry, and they have been encouraged by Riel to believe that a repetition of their offence would again meet with the lenient amiability which was shown in the clemency of the Canadian Government when influenced by Sir George Cartier. Riel should have been shot for the murder of Scott in the first insurrection. He had intended to murder more men, for he sentenced several to death, and imprisoned them under circumstances which showed that he desired they should perish before the execution of the sentence he had passed. It was not owing to him or to his lieutenant, Lepine, that more deaths were not chargeable against his "Provisional Government," and the loss of many lives, subsequently sacrificed, would have been saved if justice had taken its course. But he was allowed to live that others might afterwards suffer, and the present rising is the direct consequence of the misguided confidence which has permitted him to re-enter the country. The misdirected leniency was in great part owing to the feeling of the French in Quebec, who had in Sir George Cartier the best exponent of their views. Thoroughly loyal to the Empire, to the Canadian Confederation, and to his own Provincial countrymen, he felt with them that these half-breeds, ignorant, cruel, and foolish as they had shown themselves, were yet the representatives of those who had penetrated to the West soon after the defeat of Montcalm, and that they now were the spokesmen of men whose fate it was to be "improved off the face of the country" unless privileges, almost exceptional in their character, were given to them. They had, it was true, committed crimes; but in the eyes of a French Canadian there were "extenuating circumstances." These circumstances were recognised in the fear of the half-breeds that their place might soon know them no more, because they would be engulfed by the invasion of the white English-speaking emigrants. This fear led to the troubles in 1870. It has also been the main cause of the troubles of 1885; but no sympathy should have been allowed to weigh in the scales when deliberate murder had been committed, and such was the "execution" of Scott, a man against whom Riel had a personal grudge, and whom he caused to be shot as though the victim had been a mad dog. The

insurgent leader, in his vanity, fancied himself a little Napoleon. He fully intended the murder of more men; one of these, now an eminent capitalist who has been a member of the House of Commons, and is widely known in England as well as in Canada, namely Mr. Donald Smith, formerly of the Hudson Bay Company, was thus doomed.

Riel imprisoned him, knowing him to have much influence with the Scots loyalists in the neighbouring colony at Selkirk. He was confined in a room the window of which was broken, thus letting in the cold at an inclement season. When morning came, after a night of bitter temperature, Riel looked into the prisoner's room, and said unconcernedly to him, "M'sieur, vous vous préparerez pour la mort ! Aujourd'hui, à midi !" A pleasant announcement truly, and evidently "authentic," and made on good authority, for the messenger was at once judge and jury ! Major Boulton, who has recently had the satisfaction of gallantly leading his volunteers against his old enemy, had a similar experience. The extraordinary confidence shown by the insurgents until the vanguard of the troops came upon them, seems to be repeated now that the scene is transferred to the far away valley of the Saskatchewan. It is doubtful whether the elaborate laws for the establishment of a Provisional Government have, on this occasion, been carried as far among the Metis as when, in 1870, regulations were made on all subjects, from the establishment of a rebel Supreme Court down to such details as the exact postage charge to be levied for letters, newspapers, and reviews coming from the American frontier. As soon as the rising was repressed, the Dominion Government made very liberal grants of land to the half-breeds within the limits of the province, then much smaller than it subsequently became. The gist of the demands lately made by the half-breeds is that they should all be treated now as were their friends in Manitoba in 1870. Many indeed who sold their lands almost as soon as they were granted in that province, and moved thence northward, asked to be again dowered with the same amount they had before received. There were a comparatively small number who were outside of Manitoba, and in occupation of farms. Many were leading the semi-nomad life of the "freighter" in taking goods along the Prairie trails to distant settlements such as Edmonton, starting from Fort Garry in the spring and returning only after many months. Many again were living with the Indians. But there was a certain number, variously estimated, who in the Qu'Appelle valley, the Saskatchewan valley, and near Edmonton in the far North-west, were carelessly cultivating farms. All these have always claimed that what the Manitoban half-breed had, they too should enjoy. It was true that they would all have an equal chance, with the settlers who were beginning to make their way into the country. All could have 160 acres and pre-empt 160 more. No one desired to disturb them where they had

settled. But at Prince Albert and about Batoches there had been delay in the grant of definite land allocations, causing some discontent among the Whites also. The Metis, disliking the coming of "Les Anglais," imagined that they would be disturbed, and having been first in the country, did not like to be treated on the same footing with new comers. They wanted more than the ordinary settler obtained, and they hated the new surveyors' square blocks, and that any stranger should be sandwiched in among them on lands for which the Metis had perhaps procured no Government patent. When crops failed, a proportion of their number demanded to be fed. Their peculiarly shaped settlements were not to be altered or touched. All they asked was to be given at once, so that they might again realise if they chose, and again move away and pitch their tents on some new ground which might seem desirable, and less likely to have the improving white farmer from Ontario, English-speaking, and unsympathetic as a neighbour. Religion has had its share in combining them against the advance of the Canadian British, but the influence of the priests has been for good, and has tended to keep them to the paths of peace, by insuring to them a channel for the transmission of their grievances to the ear of the Government. The Oblate Fathers have missions in the Qu'Appelle valley as well as in the far north, where schools and chapels have done much to civilise these half-wild people. Loyalty, however, to the Dominion cannot be said to exist among the Metis, and it can only be by making it their evident and immediate interest to keep quiet, that their tranquillity can be insured. "Come up and let us unite and take quiet possession of the good land in the north," they have recently said to each other, "otherwise everything will be given to the English." It is this fear and feeling which has prompted them to ask Riel to come to them from his retreat to the south of the frontier, and to espouse their cause, as their old, boldest and most successful champion.

There has been so much grumbling about the increase of the mounted police, and about the augmentation of the yearly expenses connected with the Indians, that the Government cannot alone be blamed for neglecting to prepare for the coming trouble. The Opposition, whose chiefs, like the ministers, never visited the Saskatchewan country, have uniformly objected to any necessary increase in expenditure; and it was only grudgingly that the increase in the excellent mounted police force was sanctioned by the Opposition Press in 1882, although there had been up to that date only 250 troopers stationed in a country having 35,000 Indians, a rapidly augmenting influx of white settlers, and about 400,000 square miles of territory to watch. The half-breed's superiority to the Indian, evident enough to those who have been in the company of both, makes the Metis and his semi-British cousin look down on the painted savages, whose highest

ideal of enjoyment is to follow each other in single file in a circle, stamping the while, and uttering hideous cries to the beat of a tom-tom. This is a feast, or thirst, or war dance, always alike, under different names for different occasions, and followed when there is a "pow-pow" by interminable speeches, at which the only interpreter to the white man must be a half-breed. I have seen a half-breed standing patiently hour after hour interpreting the long-winded rhetoric of the Crees, Sioux, and Blackfeet. Sometimes the Indian talk flowed on, and the interpreter would not interpret. "What is he saying?" we asked. "Oh!" was the reply, "he's only talking Indian," which meant that nothing had passed but compliments, flowery similes, observations on the beauties of nature, and nothing to the purpose of the meeting. The savage is not practical. The half-breed often is. On the present occasion, he, being the cleverer, has persuaded the savages that they can get more "grub" by following his example and making common cause with him in raising trouble. He knows that in the long run it will be death to the "Injuns," but his present purpose is served by using them, and he has no scruple in doing so. It may be politic to conciliate these half-breeds by giving them the exceptional land privileges they demand, but they have no right to more than is given to every settler. "Les Anglais" can, however, afford to be generous.

It is a misfortune that colonisation of the North-west from French Canada has not been more seriously prosecuted. There has been a good deal of talk of planting French Canadians in those regions, but the requisitions they have made to have tracts of land, so that a Catholic population could have their schools and churches so placed as to make a Catholic "enclave," have been difficult to concede, and there has been a failure to form in Quebec companies for the purpose. If such companies had been formed they would have had as good, and, indeed, a better, chance than many other land companies, for they would have had less difficulty in fulfilling the Government conditions of rapid settlement. Their inclinations have led them in other directions nearer home, and the regions to the north of the city of Quebec around Lake St. John and the affluents of the Ottawa have absorbed those who have not migrated to New England. If French colonisation could have been directed more to the Prairies there would not be so much feeling of sympathy for the half-breeds among the inhabitants of Quebec province, for the Metis would not have been the only representatives of their race and religion in the new territories. New French Canadian settlers possessed of the usual square of land, would have deemed what was good enough for them good enough for the half-breeds also. American customs would not have dealt so tenderly with the half-breeds' idiosyncrasies as has the Canadian Government. It is in loyalty to the Dominion and in taking part in the colonisation of the Prairies

that the only possible policy of the French Canadian can be found. It is utterly against their own true interests to imagine for one moment that the artillery fire at Batoche is the last echo of the conflict on the plains of Abraham. But English Canadians will agree with their French countrymen that conciliation and persuasion are the best weapons to be employed when transitions affecting people's modes of living have to be faced by them, and a generous and even favouring treatment is to be preferred. Give the half-breed rather more than his due, and feed the Indian even beyond treaty requirements if the times of transition bear hard on them. We will now turn the attention of the reader from the swarthy, black-haired half-breed, clad in his European jacket and trousers and felt hat, to his relation, the "sauvage." Whether he be Sioux, Cree, or Blackfoot, or Assiniboine, his appearance is much the same. Lithe, well-made, with a skin the colour of coffee and milk, he disfigures himself on all possible occasions of ceremony or merry-making by painting his face in hideous bars or blotches of vermilion or green or yellow. His head-gear, unless he has got possession of an old hat with gold braid on it, consists only of feathers. His long hair is partly braided with brass rings, and his body is covered with a skin or cloth tunic prettily embroidered with beads. His leggings, also of antelope or other skin, reach only to his hips, which are adorned with long fringes of cut leather. His feet are covered with embroidered moccasins. Often he has lost much of this finery; and few tribes now possess many horses. His arms are Winchester repeating rifles and shot guns, the bow having been discarded, or used only by the boys. His fine tents of buffalo hides have usually given place to poor shelters of cotton, for he has been too poor to buy good canvas, and the buffalo have been killed as the white man advanced. But, as far as the Government has been able to do so, it has protected him. In 1875 and 1876 Governor Morris concluded treaties with almost all the roving bands. They knew hunting gave a poor living, and they agreed to live on tracts of land reserved for them, to accept five dollars a year per head for each man, woman, and child, and to be helped with seed for corn-growing, and by instructions in farming. Until lately all went well. The problem was how to make them work so that they should aid themselves, the Government aiding them. When really pinched they were helped. Perhaps of late they have not been helped enough, especially if it be true that the fish in the lakes of the Saskatchewan Valley were so poached that the supply of food from this source greatly failed.

But the tribes to the south around Fort Walsh and Fort McLeod have during four years regularly received rations, while large sums were everywhere spent in inducing Indians to grow seed, listen to farming instructors, and in furnishing them with horses and ploughs. Their dislike to work is not incurable, as was proved in the case of many bands, but there were always some "bad Indians" who

would do nothing but beg. 'With a mixture of character strange to us, starving Indians, starving because they would not work, have lately appeared at settlers' houses seeking food, and famished as they were, would not take anything until they could see the owner and beg from him. If he was away they would wait until he returned. But evil counsellors have lately beguiled the northern bands into violence, and when the Indian means mischief, he prepares secretly, and is sudden and cruel in his purpose. One sign that union for depredatory objects is contemplated by them is the sending round of tobacco. This had been done to some extent in 1881, when I met all the great bands, and talked to them on their condition, but there was hardly any case in which any threat of violence was used, and for more than three years after that date all went well. I remember a warning as to their possible treachery being given by a poor fellow, whose recent murder by Indians proved the truth of his saying, that they could not be trusted. He was a survivor of the great massacre by Indians in Minnesota in 1863, when one thousand five hundred whites were killed. Quin, for so the man was named, had escaped wounded. He was my interpreter during a long council held with the Crees near Battleford, and I asked him if in 1863 he had no warning of trouble. "No, sir," he emphatically said. "We had been talking to the Sioux on the day on which the murdering began, and those Indians were just as civil to us then, when they had determined on our death that night, as your Indians here have been to you." Poundmaker, whose very name—the maker of the pound to impound the buffalo—shows how the old hunting days have passed away for ever, the Cree chief who lately took prisoner the Hudson's Bay Factor and several families of settlers, and had a sharp fight with Colonel Otter's troops, joined our party in 1881 at Battleford, and acted as our guide for several hundred miles, until we had a better guide. He had been formed by the same old ways, and they would not get to the frontiers of America in Montana. Although a Cree, he had been much with their hereditary enemies, the Blackfeet, to whose country he guided us, and had been instrumental in keeping the peace between these old enemies. He seemed to have been impressed with what he heard on that journey, for when he went back he made an excellent speech to his tribe, telling them that it was for their good always to be friendly to the whites, who had so many warriors always coming from the south and east, and that his people must cultivate the land, for that would give them food, which hunting could not give them now; and "above all," he was said to have concluded, "let the women not run about from lodge to lodge bearing tales, and making mischief in the camp." I thought that this fine, gaunt, deliberate hunter,

Who would have thought that this fine, gaunt, deliberate hunter, philosopher and promising agriculturist, would in four years head his tribe in an attack on Battleford? Yet so it has happened, and bad advice and inadequate food supply, owing to summer frosts, must be held accountable for it. Luckily, the Cree bands over which Pound-

maker has influence are confined to the North Saskatchewan Valley, far away from the railway which traverses Manitoba, Assiniboia, and Alberta. It is to be hoped that the good sense and hitherto unimpeachable loyalty of Crowfoot, the chief of the Blackfeet, who has seen Winnipeg and civilisation, will be proof against the evil example of Poundmaker. Our "intimate enemy" used to watch silently the proceedings of our great meetings with the Indians, never taking part himself in the speaking. Riding ahead of the waggons, and accompanied by a half-breed, he used to find the way across the trackless prairie by an instinct that seemed extraordinary, for much of the country had not been actually traversed by him before; but he always found us water and camping-ground close to the true line of march. Then when the mess-tent had been pitched, and darkness and the cold of autumnal night had closed over the vast yellow prairies, he was sometimes summoned to consult on our position, or to tell us in solemn, half-reluctant manner when closely questioned, of some legend of a monster snake, or wolf, or deer, or of some famous buffalo hunt. How keenly and yet unexcitedly he walked, stooping over some ill-defined footprints seen one morning on the frosty ground! A guttural sound was all he would vouchsafe, until at last he murmured that there had been thirteen buffalo passing that spot; and after some hours the small herd was found, and some of them killed, Poundmaker showing that he could move fast enough when it suited his dignity, and then relapsing over the dead shaggy carcasses into his statuesque impenetrability. His band cannot number two hundred, but he may induce others to join him in that northern region. But as the largest of these scattered camps on this line can only muster about six hundred all told, an Indian rising may play havoc with the confidence of settlers, and prevent colonisation in outlying districts, but cannot affect country near railway lands, or continue for a long time to give trouble. If food be given freely for a time, the period of difficulty will be greatly shortened. Although the saying "Feed or Fight" has unfortunately to be altered to "Fight and Feed," it may be confidently assumed that the good policy of the Government will prevail over the present difficulties when the lessons they teach of an ample generosity in times of transition have been fully appreciated, and the fire-brands who have "set the prairie on fire" shall have been "justified" in whatever manner the wisdom of the Government shall determine. The Dominion has granted the Metis all that justice demanded; policy may exact yet more, and patriotism in Canada should help the Government in the discharge of an expensive obligation. British sympathy will assuredly be fully shown to our Canadian fellow-countrymen in their time of difficulty, and for our own as well as for their sakes we must hope that the wondrous lands of the North-west may soon see the fruitful influences of agricultural life filling, with ever-increasing sounds of plenty, the vastness of their solitudes.

LOXNE.

THE HELLENIC AFTER-WORLD.

IN the year 1877 I published a short account of the reliefs usually to be met with on the tombs of the ancient Athenians, and of the inscriptions by which those reliefs were sometimes accompanied. Only seven years have since elapsed, but they have been years full of research and discovery in Greece. Through the length and breadth of the land there has been a stirring; excavations have been carried on at a score of sites, and modern Greeks have vied with the French and German archaeologists who make their head-quarters at Athens in searching everywhere for the sculptured remains of antiquity, and in publishing to the world the results of their discoveries. And in no class of ancient monuments have more extensive or more important discoveries been made than in the class of sepulchral monuments, so that we have now to revise in fresh light our opinions of seven years ago. In some respects we have altogether to remodel those opinions. So rapid is in our days the growth of Greek archaeological science, that every year consigns to limbo some dictum of the older school of archaeologists, who laid down rules as to Greek art with all the courage of limited experience.

But the chief discoveries of sepulchral reliefs have been made outside Attica. Nothing has appeared to throw doubt on the thesis, firmly established by the discovery of the great Athenian cemetery by the gate Dipylon, that in sculpturing their tombs the minds of the Athenians exhibited a strong tendency to look backwards rather than forwards, to dwell on the life which finds its termination in the grave, rather than on that which there begins. Most people are more or less acquainted with the typical Athenian sepulchral reliefs. Every one can now study specimens of the class in the new museum of casts at South Kensington. In most cases their subject is either an individual, represented as occupied in some favourite pursuit, or a family group, parents and children, brothers and sisters, seated together or greeting one another. Gently and with exquisite taste there is introduced into the scene some detail which gives a hint of the approach of death: the figures have an air of grieving without apparent cause; they seem to be setting out on a journey without apparent purpose; only now and then figures of Hermes, the conductor of souls, or of the ferryman Charon in the foreground, suggest what is the reality which casts so sad a shadow on charming social scenes.

One kind of reliefs not rare in Attica, but found also in other parts of Greece and in Asia Minor, has caused more doubt and

roused longer discussions than the rest. It is the class on which a banquet is represented; a man, or two men, reclining at a table which is covered with food and wine, their wives seated at their feet, in Greek fashion, while slaves serve the repast. In the idea of a banquet served thus in the gate of death there is something incongruous and strange, something which provokes theory and discussion. Two schools of archaeologists have explained the scene in two very different ways, the one school maintaining that the banquet represented belongs to ordinary everyday life, and to the past history of the person whose tomb it adorns; while another school have held that in this particular case the reference is not to the past but to the future, to the life after death, and the enjoyments which belong to it. The former interpretation was advocated by Welcker and Jahn, and is supported by the analogy of the other Athenian reliefs, which do undoubtedly refer to the past rather than the future. Yet we now know beyond any doubt that the latter interpretation is the true one. We now know that the custom of referring only to the life of the past was not by any means universally observed in the subjects painted and sculptured on Greek tombs. It was the line taken by the high art of Athens and other great cities; indeed, it best suited the instincts of all Greek art, to which all that was vague and mystic was repulsive and ugly. But it did not altogether satisfy the emotions and beliefs of the common people, especially in the more backward cities of Hellas, and among conservative races like the Dorians and Arcadians. They did not believe that human life ended at the grave, and they did not content themselves with representations which seemed to imply that such was the case. They loved to think of and represent their dead ancestors as still living.

In the year 1877 Messrs. Dressel and Milchhoefer, two members of the German school of Athens, wandering through Peloponnese in the laudable fashion of German students, and eagerly looking out for works of ancient art, lighted at Sparta upon some very remarkable monuments then recently exhumed. These were certain stelæ or slabs, bearing a relief which represented two persons, a man and a woman, enthroned side by side, and depicted in a very archaic style of art. The man usually holds a wine-cup and the woman grasps the end of her veil. A snake appears close behind the pair, and sometimes there are depicted as approaching them with offerings, votaries whom their diminutive size shows to be of far less dignity than the principal figures. It was at once evident to the discoverers of these slabs that the subject depicted on them was the offering of sacrifices to a male and female deity. But, as is so often the case with new and important discoveries, the whole bearing of the reliefs was not at first seen. Two theories were at once mooted in regard to them. One set of archaeologists saw, in the seated male figure

holding the wine-cup the god Dionysus, and in his consort either Ariadne, or perhaps Persephone, who was in some parts of Greece regarded as the wife of the Chthonic Dionysus. Other archaeologists preferred to consider the pair as Hades and Persephone, the great deities of the unseen world, and supposed that the intention was to represent sacrifices brought to them by mortals as a propitiation, and in hopes to secure their favour in the world of shades. Messrs. Dressel and Milchhoefer accepted at first the view last mentioned, and adduced several arguments in its favour. They pointed out the prevalence of the worship of Hades and the great goddesses of nature in several parts of Peloponnesus, particularly at Andania in Messenia, and in Arcadia, and tried to show that the character of the offerings was well fitted to the cultus of these dread powers of the future world. The wine-cup in the hand of Hades they regarded as a substitute for the cornucopie which he more commonly carries.

This view, though incorrect, was at the time very natural. But very shortly a number of monuments of a similar kind were brought to light in other parts of the Peloponnesus and of Northern Greece, which made it impossible longer to doubt of the true meaning of the Spartan stele.

For instance, at Sparta two slabs were discovered which had certainly served as tombstones, and bore the names of Timocles and Aristocles respectively. On each of these was represented a seated male figure, holding wine-cup and pomegranate. Here the representation was evidently of the man who was buried in the tomb. And in other cases the person thus seated is female, in some cases holding a pomegranate or feeding a serpent from a cup.

These fresh instances have suggested for the earlier-found and better-known Spartan reliefs, a new interpretation which is, I believe, universally accepted. The pair seated in state must be the deceased hero or ancestor and his wife. They await the offerings of their descendants and votaries, who bring them such objects as were in Greece commonly offered to the dead—fowls, and eggs, and pomegranates. The snake who accompanies them is the well-known companion and servant of the dead.

We find, then, in Peloponnesus and in other parts of Greece, in quite early times, abundant monuments testifying to the prevalence of a widely-spread cultus of the dead. We have proof that not only did the gods, and those heroes of old who had almost stepped into the rank of the gods, receive worship and sacrifice in the temples and houses of the Greeks, but also ordinary human beings after their death. In text-books which deal with Greek antiquities we had already read of these customs, but they had hitherto been supposed to have left little trace in literature and in art. Men well acquainted with Greek history and customs had often scarcely heard of them or

given them a thought. But now the evidences of the customs of *venetia* in Greece need no longer be sought in writers of Alexandrian times and in inscriptions. They are thrust under the eyes of all who gain but a superficial acquaintance with Greek art. It is not too much to say that the new discoveries are to archaeologists quite a revelation, and of the greatest value to those who care to study the origin and the history of religious belief.

We will briefly set forth the Greek beliefs on the subject of the life after death, and secondly, give a general view of the Greek sepulchral monuments which illustrate those beliefs, ending with the Attic sepulchral banquets from which we took our start.

An idea which commonly prevails among barbarous peoples as to the life after death is, that it is in essentials merely a continuation of the ordinary mundane existence. When alive the warrior requires a house, when dead he must be sheltered in a tomb; and the form and arrangements of early tombs often follow those of the house. When alive the warrior requires food; when he is dead food must still be brought to him in his new abode. He must have drink also, and pleasant smells, lamps to light his darkness, and abundant vesture and armour for him to wear. As hunting was the principal pleasure in life, so in the life after death the warrior must have all things necessary for the chase. His horse and his dog must be slain and buried with him, that they may continue their services to their master. His wife must also attend his steps to the new state of existence; and enemies must be slain at the spot where he is buried, in order that he may have slaves to do his behests in the future as in the past.

This general statement is fully borne out by the testimony afforded by the graves of ancient peoples. The walls of Egyptian tombs are painted with innumerable scenes of public and religious and private life—scenes like those amid which the dead man had passed his days. To the real scenes the paintings bore a similar resemblance to that which the shadowy life of the tomb bore to the real life of the flesh. The interior of Etruscan tombs is adorned with scenes of revelry, of amusement, and sport, to glad the eyes of the *hero* hovering within and disperse his *ennui*; and in these tombs are found the bones of the warrior's horse and dog, who were slain to bear him company on the last journey. In early Greek graves are found armour and vestments, cups and vases, weapons and utensils. The writer will not easily lose the sense that the Greeks of early times really believed in this existence of the tomb which flashed upon him when, in turning over the spoils found by Dr. Schliemann in the tombs at Mycenæ, he came upon a whetstone, actually put among the swords that their edge might be renewed when blunted with use.

In the later times of the Egyptians and the Greeks this naïve faith

driven away, and was replaced by beliefs of a more worthy and spiritual kind. Men came to believe in a realm of souls far away beyond the desert or hidden in the depths of the earth, and presided over by mighty and just rulers. They began to feel that it was the soul only that survived death, and that it did not stay at the tomb, but went on a long journey, and abode far from descendant and townsman. But we find always in history that customs outlast the beliefs which gave birth to them, and often survive into quite a different state of opinion. So it was in this case. The burial customs which arose when the grave was supposed to be a real abode were kept up when the soul was believed entirely to quit the body at death. It was still in the tomb that provision for the future life was heaped up. It was in the actual mouth of the corpse that the fee for Charon, the ferryman, was placed. It was to the very place of burial that offerings were brought on the 'all souls' days of antiquity. The logical complement of the later doctrine of Hades would have been to regard as immaterial what happened to the body after death. But this was a point never reached by ancient nations; they always regarded want of burial of the body as fatal to the bliss of the soul in Hades.

Changes did, however, take place in burial customs in consequence of the growing discordance between them and popular belief. They were still maintained, but in more and more perfunctory and unreal fashion. The arms and ornaments buried with the dead became flimsier and less fit for use. Every archaeologist knows that sometimes the graves of Greece and Etruria contain the mere pretence of offerings: gold ornaments as thin as paper; loaves and fruits of terra-cotta; weapons unfit for use, and vases of the most unserviceable kind. "*In sacris simulata pro veris accipi*," wrote Servius; and in no class of sacred rites does hollow pretence more commonly take the place of reality than in those connected with funerals and tombs.

Such, in merest outline, is the history of Greek beliefs as to the life beyond the grave during the course of the historical ages. And if we examine a few examples of the various groups of sepulchral monuments to be found in that country, we shall find ample illustration of our sketch.

Among the earliest of Greek sculptured tombstones are those Spartan reliefs of which mention has already been made. In them we see the departed ancestor and ancestress seated like gods to receive the homage of survivors. When the seated hero holds out a wine-cup, it seems a broad hint to survivors to fill it. Accordingly, in Boeotian and other reliefs, we actually see a female figure approaching to fill from a pitcher the extended vessel. And upon Greek graves there commonly lay, as we learn from the testimony of excavations, an amphora of coarse ware to receive the doles of wine brought to the cemetery. The food brought by suppliants on the Pelopon-

nesian stela consists of eggs and fowls, and more especially the pomegranate. This last seems to have been the recognised food of the shades. Hades gives it to his stolen bride, Persephone; and she, by eating it, becomes incapable of quitting the place of the dead to return to her bright existence in the upper air. And to this day pomegranate seeds are one element in the sweet cakes which are made to be distributed by those who have lost a friend, at certain intervals after his death—cakes evidently representing those bestowed in old times on the lost friend himself.

This realism of offerings to the dead naturally suggests to us that the idea of offerings of food and wine to the deities themselves arose from the transfer to them of ideas originally connected with dead mortals. In historical times the Greeks made wide distinction between the offerings to deities and those brought to heroes, both as to time and mode of sacrifice, and as to the objects; but this distinction is not fundamental, and we cannot help looking on the whole custom of sacrifice as one imported into the cultus of deities from that of the dead. It is not unusual to represent deities also in sculpture as holding out a cup or vessel, and it seems clear that whatever meaning the Greeks attached to the action in later times, it must in earlier have signified a readiness to receive offerings. Great sculptors substituted for this action, which to them seemed trivial or mean, some higher motive, placing a Victory or a sceptre in the hands of the greater divinities; but in case of some of the lesser, such as Τύχη, Fortune, the patera remained to the end a not unusual attribute.

The snake which is erect behind the pair stands in a very intimate relation to the dead. His habit of dwelling in holes in those rocky spots which the Greeks chose for their cemeteries, amid which he mysteriously appeared and disappeared, originated the idea that he was either the companion or even the impersonation of the dead ("incertus geniumne loci famulumne parcais esse putet"); and the idea was fostered by the manners of the reptile—his shyness when approached, and the wisdom and subtilty attributed to him by the ancients. It is curious to find, in other reliefs, the horse and the dog in the place of the snake. Their presence, indeed, is not in itself surprising. They have their place beside their master in the sculpture by the same right by which their bones were laid beside his in the grave. As they died with him and are his companions in the fields of Elysium, so they swell his state when he sits to receive homage and offerings. Yet it is somewhat strange to find horse and dog, which imply a free and open life of hunting and amusement, alternately with the sad and cold serpent, which belongs to no happy hunting-ground, but to the rocky soil of the cemetery.

Such being the symbolism of Spartan tombs, we naturally inquire with what purpose these designs were sculptured. With us a grave-

stone is merely a reminder, placed on the spot where some of our friends are laid, and intended to awake in the survivors memories, sad, indeed, yet touched with a certain melancholy pleasure, since it can never be altogether sorrowful to think of those we have loved, ever after their departure.

But we are accustomed, it must be remembered, to look upon images as mere works of art, and quite without associations of worship. The Greeks, on the other hand, being idolaters—that is to say, accustomed to assist their religious sentiments by images of the gods in painting and in sculpture—were accustomed also to consider the presence of the gods as especially belonging to their images. And there can be no doubt that they carried the same associations to the reliefs on the tombs of their ancestors. They regarded those worthies as distinct, of course, from the images of them on the tombs, and yet they supposed that there was a bond of connexion between the two, and that the soul of the deceased ancestor was present in the carving on his tomb as he was not present elsewhere. These reliefs, then, are in a sense the idols of the domestic worship of the Greeks, or at least of the less civilised tribes among them, and were never looked upon without a touch of religious awe.

A series of monuments beginning at a scarcely later date than the Spartan stela is that of the Lycian rock-cut tombs of the Xanthus valley. Some of these are elaborate architectural monuments, adorned with a profusion of sculpture, and of great importance for the history of art. But all these monuments, including the Harpy tomb, the Nereid monument, and the "heroön" recently discovered at Göl Bashi, served undoubtedly as memorials of chiefs or kings buried beneath them. The sculptured friezes which adorn them embody sometimes heroic or local myths. Sometimes, as in the case of the Nereid monument, they seem to commemorate historical deeds and expeditions. But certainly, in several instances, they bear reliefs representing the buried ruler as enthroned in state, waiting to receive the homage of survivors. As an instance, we may cite the pediment-sculptures of the well-known Nereid monument, now in the British Museum. Here the presence of votaries suggests, and even proves, that the scene represented belongs to the life beyond the tomb, and not to the mundane existence of the buried king.

German *savants* have of late advocated the theory that the mysterious seated figures which adorn the beautiful archaic Lycian monument in the British Museum which is known as the Harpy tomb are really deceased heroes and heroines seated to receive offerings from votaries who reverently approach them. Hitherto the sculptures of this lovely monument have offered a wide field for conjectural explanations, some of a very fanciful character; but without fully declaring in favour of the new interpretation, we must confess that it is far

better in accord than are most others with the simplicity of early art, and the primitive beliefs which we have reason to attribute to the Lycian race.

At a later period in Lycia, that is to say in the fourth and succeeding centuries B.C., these seated personages cease to appear, and in their place we have men reclining on couches at tables covered with food and wine, their wives sometimes seated at their feet. This is a curious fact, for we know that in Homeric days the Achæan heroes used to sit at table, and the custom of reclining came in at a later period. Perhaps that custom made its way into Lycia later still, when the stream of Greek art and Greek influence set strongly towards the Asiatic coast in the days of the second Athenian confederacy. However that be, it is quite clear that the banqueting groups of later Lycian tombs are intended to represent the physical enjoyments of the future life, and to suggest to the living that it was their duty to bring the offerings due at stated seasons of the year.

In the case of Peloponnesian monuments also we observe a transition of the enthroned hero from a sitting to a reclining position, though in Greece that transition takes place at an earlier period than in Lycia.

Let us next turn to another class of reliefs, those in which the deceased is represented, not as seated in state, but as riding on a horse, or leading one by the bridle. These designs are not found at Sparta, though they have been sometimes discovered at Argos and elsewhere in Peloponnesus. But they belong more especially to Northern Greece, particularly to Bœotia. I think that the veneration for ancestors implied in them is less intense than that implied in the Spartan reliefs, and for several reasons. At Sparta the hero is seated on a throne, in an attitude which belongs only or properly to the greater deities, especially Zeus and Hades. In Bœotia he is no longer seated but riding. The Greeks did not represent their greater deities, excepting Poseidon, as riding on horseback, though they not unfrequently place them in chariots. This would seem to them a position of insufficient dignity. But there was a lower and less exalted race of beings than the gods, whom the Greeks did in a marked degree associate with horses. These are the demi-gods or heroes, the sons of the gods mostly by a mortal mother, like Herakles and Asklepius and Castor and Pollux. There was a decided distinction in Greece between the honours of these subordinate beings and those paid to the gods. And it is notable that the heroes were usually represented as riders. Everyone knows that this was the case with the twins Castor and Pollux, termed the Dioscuri, or the sons of Zeus *par excellence*. And those acquainted with Greek vases and other remains know that the same character belonged more or less to all those unnumbered heroes who enjoyed temples in later Greece as founders of cities, or great

warriors or inventors of useful arts, or as noted benefactors of the human race. The inscription engraved on a notable relief of this class is this: "Dedicated to Aleximachus by Calliteles." And it is supposed that Aleximachus is not the real name of the dead person thus commemorated, but a sort of state name or heroic name bestowed on him after death by those who wished to raise him to the rank of a local hero. Such heroising of any man who was in his life at all distinguished was usual in all parts of Greece, and at all periods of Greek history.

A point which requires some notice in both the Spartan and Boeotian reliefs is the very frequent presence on them of a lady accompanying the divine or semi-divine ancestor. Naturally we suppose her to be his wife. And this interpretation very well suits the Spartan tombs, where she sits by the hero's side in equal state. At Sparta women were held in higher honour than in the rest of Greece. Elsewhere they were looked on often either as household drudges or as mere playthings, but in Sparta they were regarded as real helpers to the men, and capable of that patriotism which the Spartans regarded as the highest virtue. And as a consequence of this esteem we find women in more than one of the crises of Spartan history, when the city was in danger from invasion or sedition, come nobly to the front and save the State which had treated them honourably. At Sparta, then, there is no reason why they should not occupy a divine place beside their husbands after death, as they had occupied a place beside him when alive. But in the rest of Greece such honour paid to a deceased woman might well seem excessive. And in the horseman reliefs of Northern Greece she does not seem to share the worship of the hero, but rather to be doing honour to him, to meet him with an offering, and to pour wine into the cup which he holds out to be filled.

Returning to the common banqueting reliefs of later Greece, we are justified by the analogy of Peloponnesian and Lycian monuments in regarding them as belonging altogether to the Hellenic cultus of ancestors. And we thus see that the feelings which in pre-historic ages gave birth to the worship of ancestors never died out among the Hellenes. To the last days of their pagan life no subject was more commonly depicted on their tombs than the offerings to forefathers, and no custom was more religiously kept up than those relating to the periodical visitation and feeding of the dead.

In some minds the question may arise whether the Greeks, when they sculptured the feasts of the dead, supposed those feasts to take place in the tomb, at which they commonly deposited their offerings, or in Hades, the realm of the shades. This is a question which it is easier to ask than to answer; indeed, it cannot be satisfactorily answered, for it is a matter in which the Greeks had never fully made up their minds. The gods dwelt in Olympus, yet they were also

present in their temples. In the same way the dead were imagined to dwell in the world of shades, and yet they knew what took place at their tombs, and could enjoy the offerings there set out for them. The spot where a man's body is laid can never be entirely divorced from his personality. Do not we ourselves regard as sacred the spot where the body of a friend sleeps in death, although among us the idea of the distinctness of soul and body is far more clear and general than among the Greeks? These are confusions of thought so deeply worked into the web of human nature that it may be doubted if they will ever be worked out of it.

Thus has the gradual accumulation of facts put an end to one of the longest and most interesting feuds ever waged in the field of classical archaeology. The dispute is made the more remarkable because the greatest names have, on the whole, appeared on the wrong side. And the final verdict is entirely contrary to that which hasty theorists would suppose to be that of common sense. We moderns could easily understand that deities should be depicted as reclining on a couch to receive the homage of mankind. And we could understand that the banqueting reliefs of tombs should be mere transcripts from ordinary daily life. But we find it very hard to understand how the Greeks, possessing the notions of the future life with which we meet in Homer and Pindar, and in the mockeries of Lucian, could erect such frequent monuments at all periods as memorials of the worship of the dead. We find it difficult simply because the frame of mind implied is one of which we have no experience. But the view hardest to receive is that which is true.

There yet remain various funeral customs of the Greeks which still await explanation, although we feel that the explanation is brought nearer year by year by new discoveries. For example, the beautiful figures of terra-cotta which of late years have reached us in such quantities from Asia and Greece, especially Tanagra, are connected with Greek burials in a very remarkable way. They are never found except in connexion with tombs. But they are not placed in the graves in an orderly or regular fashion. At Tanagra and Myrina and other sites they are seldom found entire, but almost always broken in a purposeful manner, the head usually torn off and lying apart. And they are as often to be met with in the earth over and beside a grave as in the grave itself. Messrs. Pottier and Reinach express their conviction, based upon a long induction, that the friends of the deceased must have stood beside the grave as it was being filled with earth with these pretty images in their hands, and thrown them—first breaking them—into the hole. How can so strange a custom be explained? M. Rayet has proposed a remarkable theory on the subject. In early times, he remarks, men slew at the graves of departed chiefs their female kin or captive women to accompany them to the next world. It seems, then, likely that these terra-cotta women

of the graves are the later representatives of these real women, just as terra-cotta loaves of bread and fruits take the place of real food; and that they were thrown into the tomb to people the solitude of the grave, and to furnish the dead man with pleasing companionship in the world of shades. This theory will account for two things; first, for the fact that there are scarcely any representations of bearded men among terra-cotta images—they are nearly all of women and of boys; and secondly, for the custom of breaking the images, the breaking taking the place of the earlier slaying.

Interesting as the newly-discovered Peloponnesian reliefs are to students of Greek art and ancient life, they are at least equally important to anthropologists who look beyond Greece to the very origin of civilisation. For they can undoubtedly be used in favour of the view of those who, like Mr. Herbert Spencer, suppose the worship of the gods to have arisen later than that of deceased human beings, and to be an outgrowth from it. If we find sculpture employed as early as the sixth century B.C. in places so far apart as Lycia and Peloponnesus in making figures of the dead for the worship of the living, and if we find at a later time a regular cultus of the dead prevailing and flourishing in all parts of Greece, it would seem that the set of ideas embodied in these manifestations must have struck deep roots in the Greek mind. They seem to belong to a deeper and more primitive stratum than does the worship of the deities of Olympus. And this view is fully confirmed by the fact that whereas with the different branches of the Aryan race religious rites differ widely, and the names of the deities are diverse, yet the cultus of ancestors is common to several branches, and takes among them much the same form.

If I may venture on a moral it will be this: the whole, or nearly the whole, of the new evidence is the result of persevering researches of young members of the German school of archaeology at Athens. This is one of the many investigations by which they and their French colleagues have benefited the cause of knowledge. And not only has knowledge been benefited, but not less the discoverers themselves. Such researches as these, conducted in the seats of ancient life, are really the only training by which archaeologists can be formed, or archaeology placed in its rightful position in the very front of historical studies. Museums of sculpture and of casts may help us; but not until the proposed English school at Athens is in working order, and some of our most brilliant young graduates are sent to study at the fountain-head, will England recover a position like that which she once held, as the nation most deeply interested in the study of classical lands and the beautiful remains of classical architecture and art.

PERCY GARDNER.

PARIS AS AN ENGLISH RESIDENCE.

It is said, across the Atlantic, that "good Americans go to Paris when they die." To us English Paris does not represent paradise; and though most of us manage to see it at least once, as a sight to be included in travel, we feel no particular enthusiasm about it; while few indeed are the Britons who conceive the notion of fixing themselves in the Department of the Seine. Such of us as settle down beyond the Channel go usually to other lands. English residents in France are rare; out of the 800,000 foreigners, men, women, and children, who inhabit that country, only 30,000 (less than four per cent. of the whole) are British subjects, and of this small total barely one-third is domiciled in Paris. Furthermore, as by far the larger portion of the 10,000 English people who are grouped there is composed of servants, clerks, and small traders, it is probable that if the number of our countrymen living on their own means could be exactly counted it would be found not to reach 300.

But how is it that a city so irresistibly seductive to others should attract so few of us? Why do we direct our steps to all sorts of other places and keep away from the very abode which allures every one but ourselves? The reason is that ordinarily constituted English men and women cannot discover in Paris either permanent attractions or material advantages. Others can fit themselves to it, but we cannot. Our national character does not need what Paris offers; our national habits require satisfactions which it does not give; our national capacities cannot utilise its peculiar potentialities. It is true that the same objections apply, more or less, to all other residences abroad, but we expect less from other places; we are more forbearing and less exacting towards them; as they are less big we do not feel so lost in them, and we condescend to take some pains occasionally to get out of them such contentments as they can supply. In Paris we seem to expect, from the immensity of its reputation, that everything should be ready to our hand, and we are surprised and even aggrieved to discover that we have to labour to make a nest there. The outside qualities of the place are so manifest, even to the newest arriver and the most isolated wanderer, they are so thoroughly part of it, they can be enjoyed so easily, without skill, experience, or trouble, that we instinctively complain because its inner merits are not equally visible, because they lie out of sight, are inaccessible to strangers, and cannot be discovered without time and work. So, as these inner merits are precisely those which a permanent resident most needs to discern and enjoy, we mistake their non-appearance for non-existence, and go elsewhere.

Amongst the various bribes to expatriation, there are four which exercise peculiar influence—health, economy, the education of children, and the hope of getting into society; and in no one of these four forms does Paris entice the current English man or woman. Its merits are immense, but so far as the average British enquirer is concerned they do not lie in any of these directions. What its merits are will be indicated presently; let us begin with its defects, as most English people see them.

In health, Paris is on a level with a hundred other places. It has nothing of its own to offer. Its climate presents a fair average of the qualities and faults of central Continental weather; the air is drier and more vivifying than that of England; extremes of heat and cold are sometimes felt, but they are unfrequent; strong winds are rare; and though fogs have become somewhat acclimatised of late years, the air is on the whole fairly bright and pleasant. But the same atmosphere may be found almost everywhere along the same parallel of latitude. The sanitary conditions are good; the sewerage is excellent; the water abundant and pure; and the precaution against infection in all its forms are minute and well applied. The material conditions of life are, however, growing so much alike in all large towns that we are living everywhere under more and more similar influences, and it may be said, without much inexactness, that so far as Europe is concerned, what used to be called, especially, a healthy or unhealthy place, is becoming difficult to find. Epidemics come and go in Paris as they do in other centres of population, but they are seldom traceable to local causes, and usually assume a general character. But all these qualities are merely negative; they imply the absence of objections, not the presence of recommendations; Paris possesses no positive advantages in climate or health, and English people will not be tempted to live in it for reasons of that sort.

The question of economy presents itself in a different position. The possibility of economy is there, but we cannot apply it. No place is cheaper than Paris, considering what can be got out of it, provided only you know what to get, how to get it, and how to enjoy it when got. But that is precisely what we do not know. So we call Paris dear. And dear it certainly is if we judge by prices alone, for almost everything costs more there than in London. Yet the organization of life is so simple and the domestic ways are so thrifty, that in spite of the immense rise which has taken place in the value of all necessaries, housekeeping in Paris comes out in the total less expensive than in London. The difference is not, however, large enough to constitute a notable diminution of outlay, and to supply by itself a sufficient motive for adopting Paris as a residence.

And if Paris can do little for us in the two directions of health and economy, it is of still less use to us in the matter of education.

It is, perhaps, the last place in which English parents would wish to form their children. We consider the development of a certain particular character and line of opinion in our boys to be even more important than knowledge, and no satisfaction of that aim is discoverable in any school in France, whether it be lay or religious. Measured by the English standard France is about the worst country in Europe for the making of boys. The schools are cheap, and are certainly good so far as teaching is concerned; the average French boy learns, indeed, more than the average English boy; in that, however, he cannot well help himself, for he is obliged to pass examinations at sixteen or seventeen, and as the institution of cramming is unknown, and he has no time to apply it if it existed, his only chance is to study seriously at school. But excellent as French schools are for instruction they contain absolutely nothing else which could tempt either English fathers or English boys. And even as regards girls the case is not much better, for great as is the power of Paris in producing bright women, the training lies, not in the schools or convents, but in the homes, in living patterns rather than in books, in contact rather than in precept. Unfortunately, however, these patterns and this contact are seldom within the reach of foreigners, and English mothers would make a vast mistake if they took their girls to Paris with the notion that their presence there would secure for them any of the higher French faculties.

And if education of the right sort is hard to get, society is perhaps even more difficult to seize. Taking Paris as a whole, and not counting the exceptions, there are few acts in life less easy than for a foreigner to induce the French to admit him cordially into their homes. It can be done; it can, indeed, be very thoroughly done; but it can only be effected in one of two ways, either by special position or by special effort, and, nationally, we shrink from effort in such a cause. We do not see that it is worth while. There is a set in Paris into which most people can enter if they please; the foreign drawing-rooms are open to them, more or less, according to their place and fitness; but French firesides are virtually closed to them, unless they take very particular pains to reach them, and no deception could be more complete than to settle down in Paris with the notion of "easily getting into French society."

Such are, briefly stated, the main objections to Paris as a home for English people. Now let us see the other side.

Before we go into it, however, it is essential to point out that in weighing objections of this sort we are bound to take account, not only of the objections in themselves, but also of the manner and degree in which they apply to each separate spectator, and of the means by which they can be overcome. They cannot be said to be substantial and self-existing, for they only have a being if the

foreigner who is confronted with them is incapable to subdue them. If they can be vanquished they have no subjective reality; they are, in that case, nothing more than momentary hindrances, which fade away before will and work. They may, therefore, constitute insurmountable obstacles to one person and offer mere healthy stimulants to another. Here comes in the influence of character and point of view, and it is precisely on the degree and power of that influence that the entire question turns. The majority of English people of the present generation sees nothing but the objections, as they have just been stated, regards them as absolute, doubts if they can be surmounted at all, and does not believe that, at the best, it is worth while to take the trouble to surmount them. A small minority perceives the means of conquering them, feels itself able to succeed in the attempt, and is convinced that success is worth winning. It is in the spirit of that minority that the arguments in favour of Paris will be considered here.

We all agree that, from the present English angle of view, Paris does not offer to the mass of our countrymen any advantages, in an applicable shape, as regards either health, economy, education, or society. But if we look again at the three latter elements of Paris life from a higher stand-point, if we try to see them as they really are, and not exclusively in their actual reference to ourselves, we shall probably form a different opinion about them.

First, as to economy. The French have become rich, and are becoming richer; but they have been poor for centuries, and the habits formed while they were poor have still great force amongst them. They have established a plan of life suited to the absence of wealth; they care little, nationally, for ostentation, have no contempt for poverty, accept thrift as being not only necessary, but wise and worthy, and gaily make the best of what they have. The rush of extravagance which broke forth under the Second Empire did not really affect those general ideas, for it was limited in its action and did not touch the country at large. The old system has remained substantially unchanged, both in principle and in practice; and though the cost of life has vastly increased of late years, the rise has been provoked by universal agencies quite as much as by local causes. The doctrine which underlies French management is that economy should be so practised as to eradicate its nastiness; to so compose it that it ceases to offend, that it acquires, indeed, a sort of scientific merit and attractiveness. This shape of economy does not seek to suppress legitimate satisfactions, it does not disregard real needs, or harshly limit justifiable spending for the mere sake of avarice. On the contrary, it calculates the items of expenditure according to their relative productiveness in life, it assigns to each of them a place in the budget corresponding to the result it generates in the aggregate of existence; it elicits from every shilling all that a shilling can produce, and it proportions the elements of outlay in such

a fashion that, while all just desires (according to position) are fairly contented, the fixed total of outgoings is not exceeded. To people who do not know what French life really is, this definition of its household tactics may appear exaggerated; it is, nevertheless, substantially correct, and it sets forth a lesson which may well be studied elsewhere. To judge the system rightly it is necessary to take account of the return realised as well as of the sum spent; to weigh the components of the return; to consider, not only what food and lodging are obtained and what is paid for them, but what are the quantity and the nature of the pleasures and other satisfactions which are procured by the expenditure. It is in this latter direction that the true cheapness of Paris manifests itself. The material detailed cost may be said to be, approximately, the same as in most other cities, though, from the difference of organisation, the general total is less; but nowhere else are you so free from the obligation to live for others, nowhere else can you maintain appearances for so little outlay, nowhere else are the ordinary forms of social intercourse and amusement so accessible to small purses, nowhere else is what is called a position so independent of money, nowhere else can you obtain for nothing so large a share of intellectual enjoyment. The one condition of all this is that you know how to do it. It is because the French do know, that the life they lead in Paris is certainly, for what it gives to them, the cheapest life in Europe. They manage it by suppressing superfluities, by extracting the utmost from necessities, by rendering home-pleasures so inexpensive that they lie within everybody's reach. The result is that agreeable life is possible for an outgoing of £800 a year. That sum is a minimum, but, minimum though it be, it provides, in most cases, more real satisfaction for its spenders than a London household could obtain from twice as much. No British family could, however, get on in Paris for such a sum as this; even after a fair apprenticeship they would need £1,200 or £1,500, and even then it would be necessary to be careful and not to do too much. To make this part of the question clear it will be as well to give an example of a kind which most of us could imitate. Here is the exact account, kept with instructive minuteness, of the expenses of a foreign family (not English) for the year 1884; it represents a fair average of their doings during four years which have passed since they settled in Paris. They occupy a pleasant place in the cosmopolitan section of society; they know scarcely any French people, but they go about a good deal in exotic houses; they have little dinners and numerous tea-parties. They live brightly and well, but with sense and prudence; they have no carriage, and only three servants, a man, a maid, and a cook. The family consists of father, mother, and two grown-up daughters; all of them are well dressed. Here is the table of cost:—

Rent (the furniture is their own)	£240
Taxes	28
Food	362
Wine	98
Wages: man, £48; maid, £29; cook, £34	111
Firing	32
Lighting	23
Washing	58
Repairs of furniture, &c.	55
Sundries, cabs, postage, paper, &c.	45
Books, newspapers, and music	21
Carriages in the evening	52
Dress, for mother and daughters, mostly made at home	281
Dress, father	39
Doctor and medicines	34
Small purchases for the house, plants, flowers, &c.	23
Extra cost of two months' stay at the sea in the summer	100
	<hr/>
	<u>£1,602</u>

Any fairly skilful English family could live in Paris as these people do for the same sum. Whether they would draw out from it as much gladness would depend on their own capacity. And therein lies the entire problem. The question is not to discover how much money will keep you alive, but how to extract sunshine as well as subsistence from that same money. The French show us how to do this, and, notwithstanding all the changes which have come over them, they are still showing us. Can we never profit by the example? Can we never learn to adopt so much of the French plan of home life as would enable us, not merely to inhabit Paris, but to live more simply, more cheerily, and more cheaply in England? It is in this latter use that the true interest of the question lies. The number of us who may some day fix ourselves in the capital of France can never, at the utmost, be very great; but every one of us would gain by the importation into England of some of the principles and practices which have enabled our neighbours to combine frugality with sufficiency, and to render contentment, gaiety, and social position independent of income. And even if that dream be unrealisable, even if the application of these ideas is always to be limited to such of us as may learn their value by contact with them in France, the few who profit by the lesson will, at all events, discover how to improve the conditions of existence. For that reason alone, even if there were no other, it is worth while to make a stay in Paris. Of course the process is not all pleasure; you do with fewer servants than in England, but those you have are almost always bad; you recognise that your establishment is sufficient for your wants, but it is not grand; you cannot say that you are deprived of anything you really need, but, as a whole, the material conditions of your life seem smaller; in a word your common sense is con-

tented, but your vanity is not flattered. But to live in Paris as the French live you have to put common sense above vanity. If you are not prepared to do that it is useless to go there. If, on the contrary, you are willing to exclude from the composition of your life, the superfluities which gratify no real needs, but simply minister to vain-glory; if you are disposed to apply, and are capable of applying, the practical and productive usages of France, then you will recognise that Paris is, considering how much it gives, the cheapest residence in Europe.

Education comes next. As regards boys there is no more to be said. No English boy can be brought up as an Englishman in Paris. But when we examine the good specimens of French girls we are obliged to admit that there must be something worth copying in the process which made them what they are. Different though they be from the type to which we are accustomed, incompetent though they be in some of the usual proficiencies of the English girl, scarcely any of us can fail to recognise that they have certain attributes of their own which our own daughters rarely possess, and that those attributes are of a high value in life. Of course they are not products of education alone; the special faculties of French women are, to a great extent, innate, they are hereditarily transmitted capacities, they form part of the national inheritance, and those who are not born to them cannot easily acquire them. Yet foreign girls can pick up part of them if they are quick and imitative, and if they are placed, whilst young enough, with good models. If parents choose to content themselves with commonplace girlhood in their daughters, it does not matter where they educate them; in such a case, any place is as good or as bad as another. But if their dream is to carry them to the wide development that can be attained by the application of the cosmopolitan means which are now at our disposal; if they aspire to lift them to the upper levels of delicate, intelligent womanhood; if they desire to open their heads to simplicity, economy, and a practical appreciation of life; if they wish to guide their hearts to art, their hands to handiness, their tongues to talking, and their lips to laughing; if they want to make of them women who can do most things, to expand their capacities, to arouse their reason, to form their judgment, and to shape their taste; if, above all, and as the effect of all, they would fain endow them with the most winning forms of feminine charm, then, certainly, Paris supplies an admirable working ground. There are still in Paris, notwithstanding the changes which have come over it of late, opportunities which exist nowhere else for forming women who unite the traditional graces of France to the home usefulness of a past generation and to the deeper knowledge and ampler grasp of the present. But those opportunities are difficult of access to the foreigner; if they are not opened up by

some special accident of position or connection, they can only be reached by steady cultivation of friendships and by the persevering will to win admission to the homes where they are to be found; and they can only be utilised by constant and intimate contact with the types to be copied. And, even if all the preliminary difficulties be surmounted, even if the foreign girl be placed amidst the very best surroundings, it must be remembered that success depends, after all, on the capacity of the pupil to profit by her lessons. Essential as good teaching is, personal aptitude is more important still; without it no good result can be attained. Of course it may be said that English people do not want the result, even if it can be got—that they do not wish their daughters to acquire foreign ways, and in all cases where that objection is seriously advanced, there is nothing more to be said upon the question; it falls of itself. But, in considering the qualities of Paris as a residence for some of us, it is impossible to deny the gravity of this branch of the subject, or to exclude it from examination, for it is precisely one of the points to which residents usually attach most value. And, so far as residents are concerned, it may be inferred, without unreasonableness, that, as they go abroad to live, it is precisely with the hope of meeting what they do not find at home, and of cultivating fruits which do not ripen in England. To them, at all events, these chances of enlarging the education of their girls will present interest, and to them it may be said that these chances, though rare, are not absolutely beyond their reach if they choose to seek for them, and that if they can seize them, they will discover in them another class of reasons for living in Paris for awhile.

The question of society is the last but by far the largest of the considerations we are examining here. And not only is it the widest in itself, but it is also the most important, because of the influence it exercises on the entire constitution of life. If once foreigners can work their way, thoroughly and intimately, into the society of a place, they adopt, almost instinctively, the manners and the usages of that place, and are thereby rendered able to extract from it all that it can give. It is precisely because they fail, as a rule, to penetrate within the homes of the lands they visit, that they are unable to perceive the merits of the life which is led in them, or of the characters which are formed in them. And this is even more true of France than of any other country, for the reason that, as has been already said, the French are, of all Europeans, the least inclined to open their doors to aliens. The constitution of their society is extraordinarily elastic as regards each other; its expansiveness is one of its most striking characteristics; new elements are received into it with a facility which is unknown elsewhere, but always on the condition that they be indigenous. In consequence of the absence of

any recognised upper class, of leaders or of models, the barriers which fence in elsewhere what is technically called society, have decayed and fallen to pieces; while political democratisation and the spread of money and education provoke an unceasing invasion from below of fresh elements, whose admission is facilitated by the national disposition to judge new comers by personal fitness far more than by position or wealth. And yet, notwithstanding this generous openness towards fresh candidates of their own race, they shrink from foreigners; and if foreigners wish to penetrate amongst them, they must consent to take a good deal of trouble in the matter. And it should be added at once that it is useless for either men or women to make the attempt unless they feel that they possess an inherent fitness for the work. That fitness is relatively abundant amongst people of continental birth, but it has always been strangely rare amongst the English; the mass of us, indeed, have none of it. Yet it is only to those who have it or who are able to acquire it, that it is of any use to talk about the matter. It is almost impossible for the ordinary Englishman to get himself accepted in a French house; but the special Englishman who intends to succeed and will apply the necessary means will rarely fail. Those means are so simple in themselves that it looks at first sight as if anybody could employ them; they are composed of two elements only: you must speak French and you must behave as the French do. Nothing more is required. Yet very few of our compatriots consent to behave as the French do. The reason is that "behave" is, in the sense in which it serves here, an unlimited word; it carries with it a good many obligations; it includes a good many sorts of conduct; it signifies usages, manners, movements, aspects, dress; it implies conversation, choice of subjects, character of opinions, knowledge of persons and of things; it involves ideas, sympathies, and even prejudices. This broad application of behaviour is not to be learnt in a day, but it is indispensable to acquire it before a complete result can be attained. When at last it is really reached, a very bright form of life is unfolded to the stranger, a life of which the precise like is to be found nowhere else, a life which, to those who know it fully and can measure it rightly, is more buoyant, more sparkling, and yet more simple and contenting, than any other life in Europe. It is amusing without frivolity, intelligent without effort, graceful without affectation, glittering without ostentation, exciting without fatigue, natural without uniformity. It is a life of unexampled liberty; in no other land is society so absolutely unfettered, so independent of rules, so free from the obligation to be anything in particular; it guides itself by no adopted fancies, it copies no general type; each of its members does as he likes, thinks what he likes, says what he likes, and is himself. It is

a life in which there is no absorption of the unit into the mass; each unit remains specific, counts as a separate force, and is encouraged by perceiving his own value and use. It is a life which does not cover up incapacity under the cloak of a universally imitated model; all its elements must contribute by personal effort to the common end; they must play their part or drop out of the movement. It is a life which has no passive side; it admits no silent lookers on; every one must act. It is a life which sharpens the wits, which quickens all those who share in it. And from all this springs up that wonderful *imprévu* which is the greatest of the many distinguishing marks of Paris society, that constant newness and unexpectedness in the subjects and the form of idea and talk which give such vivid brightness to all its aspects. If the ideal of a theoretically perfect society be the grouping together of men and women for the purpose of extracting from each other the largest possible proportion of varied mutual satisfactions, then, assuredly, the society of Paris approaches nearly to perfection.

Now, what is there in all this that English people should be either unable or unwilling to share? It would seem in principle, that every one of us ought to wish to have the privilege of studying such a society, and of bringing back to England with us as large a portion of its spirit as can be transported across the Channel. It would seem that such of us as can stop in Paris ought to have no keener desire than to profit by the good fortune which places us in proximity with forms of life in which there is so much and such special vitality. Yet, somehow, we wish nothing of the sort; an infinitely small section of us has found out as yet what an admirable home Paris can become, and how preponderating is the influence of society in setting up that home. The experience and the testimony of the few who have made a place there are counted for almost nothing, our national instinct remains incredulous and indifferent.

Yet, when we turn from the detached elements of the subject and view it as a whole, in its general aspect, it can scarcely be denied, even by the most unbelieving, that Paris possesses a fascination which is special to itself. The verdict of the whole world declares it. To all who approach the examination of the question in an open spirit, and who bring to it sufficient acquaintance with other places to be able to make the comparisons without which judgments have no value, Paris is the most attractive residence that men have yet constructed. People who need a particular climate, or who have personal reasons for selecting other domiciles, are justified in their preference for elsewhere; but, to all those who have no such motives, to all those who care nothing for any particular locality, and who simply seek to unite as many qualifications as possible around their home, Paris offers an unparalleled combination of advantages. The whole world

(excepting England) thinks so; it has given its collective consent to the opinion that Paris stands above all other cities in the character, the extent, and the durability of its charm. This conviction is based on considerations which affect every one, without distinction of nationality; they apply—or they ought to apply—to ourselves as to all other races. Paris is habitable all the year round; its climate is fairly good; it presents, in the highest and most diversified forms, the accumulation of resources which is the mark of a great capital; its public amusements are not very varied, but they are abundant; its inner life is delightful; its gaiety is proverbial; considering what it offers, it is cheap. The English alone dissent from this universal proposition. New inhabitants are constantly arriving in Paris from all the corners of the four Continents, but the English residents do not increase in number. Yet there are no people to whom Paris offers, geographically, such facilities of access as to us; no people who are so near to their own land there; no people who go there so naturally on their way to everywhere else. Why, then, do we shrink back where all others gather together? Because, while the others leave their country behind them when they travel, we, on the contrary, carry England with us everywhere, and accept no resting-place unless we can apply in it a large portion of our home habits. We have been able to give ourselves that satisfaction all about the face of the earth, in our colonial establishments, for the double reason that we went to them as masters, and that, outside Europe, our dominating personality has not had to contend with indigenous institutions; but we cannot achieve the same result on the Continent, because we go there as guests, and find ourselves face to face there with existing rules and practices, and are submerged in the all-covering tide of local usages. And we are even more completely swamped in Paris than anywhere else; it is so big that we count for nothing in it. In other places we try to make a fight, and render ourselves thereby as disagreeable as we can; we absorb the sitting-room of the inn for our Sunday hymns, and the garden for our lawn-tennis, with the coolest disregard for every one but ourselves, and in that fashion we console our British hearts. But in Paris we can do nothing of the sort; there we are lost in the crowd, and have to follow the crowd, and, as we cannot stand the humiliation, we do not stop there. Paris cannot be made English enough for us. Happily, however, these self-asserting tendencies, though still existing with terrible ferocity, are beginning to diminish. The British mind is expanding towards its neighbours; new notions are springing up amongst us; the faculty of cosmopolitanising ourselves is dawning, and closer union with people of other nationalities, a deeper respect for their ways, and an increased facility of taking part in their life, will be the natural consequences.

If there were no hope of this it would be idle to talk of foreign homes for the English, and especially of Paris as a possible residence for some of them. If the difficulties which repel us to-day are to stop us continuously in the future, our actual indifference to Paris will naturally persist. But, as it is evident that another spirit is arising, a change of feeling may be confidently predicted. It would be premature to talk of this change as immediately impending, but its signs are in the air, and when it has become effective we shall, assuredly, take the same general view of Paris as all our neighbours do, and proclaim, with them, that its merits are immense.

It is in Paris that English settlers will discover the greatest attainable mass of contentments which any one spot can offer; it is there that they will find themselves in contact with the most abundant opportunities, the readiest facilities, the pleasantest occupations; it is there that they will fall upon the keenest satisfactions in art, in science, in study; it is there that they will have the consciousness of the closest contact with the movement of the opinion of the world in all its directions; it is there that intellectually and socially they will get the largest return for the trouble of living; it is there that they will profit by the best talking, the best acting, and the best eating in the world. Other residences may supply some one of these various merits in a still more complete form, but no other habitation possesses them all in so equal or so advanced a degree, and no other abode furnishes such a collection of them for so low a total of household expense. Of course there are objections; the main obstacles which English people may expect to have to overcome have been already enumerated, and the means for surmounting them have been indicated. When it has been added, that there are none of the usual British occupations for men, that there are no out-door games (the tennis-court in the Tuileries, gardens cannot be counted as a general resource), and that strangers must, perforce, take up either with society or with some sort of head-work if they do not want to be entirely idle, the list of difficulties becomes tolerably complete. In order, however, to leave unmentioned no really important element of the subject, one additional inconvenience should be pointed out, although it does not apply specially to Paris, and extends over the whole earth. It is that the aptitude for foreign life, without which that life can never thoroughly succeed, represents a cost which all of us may not be willing to pay; that aptitude is not to be had for nothing, it has its price, and that price is that no one who has once thoroughly acquired it can live agreeably in England afterwards.

FREDERICK MARSHALL.

SCOTCH AND OTHER TOWNSHIPS.

In order to obtain a clear idea of the past, present, and possible future of Scottish townships, I think it would be of some utility to compare this archaical form of holding property with similar institutions to be met with elsewhere. In the report of the committee appointed by the British Parliament to inquire into the economic condition of the small tenants of the north of Scotland, we find details concerning this primitive form of property, offering no little interest to both economists and legislators. In my book entitled *Primitive Property*, I endeavour to prove that everywhere before civilisation commences, besides the habitation and its surrounding plot of ground, which is transmitted in hereditary succession from father to son, land is owned collectively by the tribe or clan, and subjected periodically to redistribution among its members. The more remote parts of Scotland, and principally the islands on the north-west coast, which are peopled by a branch of the Gaelic race, have preserved, up to the present day, traces of a similar agrarian régime. A greater or less number of small cultivators, called crofters or cottars, cultivate a certain amount of land in common, which they look upon as a farm. This is let to them by the proprietor directly, or by an intermediate person known as the *mulldleman* or *tackman*. The arable land is then equally divided among the association of crofters for one or two years, but always on the understanding that another division will be made after a certain lapse of time. The pasturage of this collective plot, the *Scathall*, is not divided, and every member of the group may send his cattle to feed there, sometimes under specified conditions.

These groups or communities (the latter is the term employed by the Parliamentary Committee) are called *townships*, and are a sort of cross between the Jugo-Slav *Zadruga* and the Russian *Mir*. They resemble the *Zadruga*, because the families composing them are all of the same race, and they resemble the *Mir*, because the arable land is not cultivated in common as in the *Zadruga*, but is periodically re-divided among all the members, and each one cultivates for himself. Townships may also be compared to the Swiss *Allmends*, only the former possesses no legal existence, and, consequently, no corporative rights whatever. They exist, but the feudal system introduced from England, which completely destroyed all rural communes, wholly ignored their existence. Another very important point which renders the crofter's condition hard is that the land does not belong to them, as in the *Zadruga*, the *Mir*, or the *Allmend*. It is owned by a non-resident landlord, to whom rent must be paid.

Sir Henry Maine, in his book called *Village Communities* (pages 95 and 97), draws a picture of the typical organization of a primitive township as it exists at Lauder, in Scotland. A hundred and five houses possess a dependency of as many plots of ground called *burgess-acres*. Out of 1717 acres owned collectively by the inhabitants one-seventh, that is to say about 240 acres, are each year set apart to be cultivated, and are divided into 105 plots, for which the 105 proprietors of the *burgess-acres* draw lots. They each retain their plot for the space of a year. The remaining six-sevenths of the common estate is reserved for pasture land; each inhabitant is entitled to send two cows and fifteen sheep to graze there. This agrarian régime is quite in conformity with that reported by Grimm as established by this ancient Scandinavian and Germanic formula: "The compt (*i.e.* the dwelling) is the mother of the field; it determines the allotment of land; the land determines the amount of pasturage; the pasturage the share of the forest; the forest the reeds for roofing the house, and the reeds the water for fishing according to the nets."

In order to give a clearer notion of the characteristics of this collective agrarian régime in the Highlands I will quote a few extracts from the report of the Parliamentary Committee and other publications. Mr. Alexander Carmichael gives a very accurate picture of this system as now still in force in the Hebrides. He tells us that the English word township represents the Gaelic word *baile*. He, however, prefers the word *townland*. (*V. Origines Parochiales*, by Cosmo Innes, and Martin's *Western Isles*, 1703.) Mr. Carmichael maintains that the *baile* or *townland* has a collective existence in various ways—by tradition, by usage, by the condition of the people, and by the treatment of the proprietor. At all events, he says, the word *townland* is recognised by law. The successive redistributions of the land owned collectively among the families forming part of the community is called *run-rig*, a corruption of the Gaelic words *roinn ruith*, "division run." In Gaelic the system is, however, usually spoken of as *mor eagan*, or great division.

The crofters of the Hebrides practise *run-rig*, but after three different methods, of which Barra and North and South Uist will furnish us each with examples. In the island of Barra, the custom is fast disappearing. The grazing grounds only are held in common, each townland being confined to its own grazing limits. An assembly of the inhabitants take the management of this, and appoint a shepherd to superintend the care of the entire herd turned out to pasture. This system is a prelude to the modern system, and might be called the neocene collective system. In South Uist, we find the intermediate or miocene system. The district of Tocar contains nine townlands and an aggregate of eighty-eight crofters. Each of these crofters

has a distinct croft of his own in his townland, and a share in the arable land common to all the crofters of the district. In addition to this, an extensive plain, locally called *machair*, belongs to them collectively. For the equitable allotment of this plain, the eighty-eight crofts are divided into four sections of twenty-two each, and these sections or wards are presided over by constables, elected by the people in the general meeting, *moot*, and the whole district by a "Maor" appointed by the landlord. The undivided ground, the *clar or leob* as it is called, is divided into four quarters, and these quarters are balloted for by the constables for their respective constituencies. When this is done, the constables, aided by the Maor and the people, subdivide their sections into the requisite number of rigs or ridges, *imirean* in Gaelic, for which the crofters cast lots, and the "rig" which falls to a man is his for three years; at the end of that time the cultivated land is abandoned, and fresh ground broken in as before.

This is exactly the system described by Cæsar and Tacitus: *Agri pro numero cultorum ab universis in vices occupantur. Arva per annos mutant et superest ager.* (Germania xxvi.) *Sed privati ac separati agri apud eos nihil est, neque longius anno remanere uno in loco colendi causa licet.* (De Bello Gallico, iv. 1.)

During summer and winter, the flocks of the entire community, herded by one or two herdsmen, as need be, are allowed to graze over the machairs, as also on the cultivated ground after harvest time.

In North Uist, nearly all the crofter land is held and worked on the intermediate system of *run-rig* as in South Uist; but three large farms held collectively are still worked on the old primitive system, which may be called the pliocene collective landholding system. They are probably the only examples to be met with in the British Isles. "I cannot help," says Mr. Carmichael, "heaving a sigh of regret on seeing a system, once and for ages the land system of millions of the human race, now discarded and disappearing for ever. It reminds one of those melancholy lines which, mingled with the dirge-like strains of the waves, so aptly render the wail of Celtic sorrow—

‘*Cha till, cha till, cha till mi tuille.*’

‘I return, I return, I return never more.’”

These three agrarian townships are called Hosta, Caolas Paipil and Heisgair; the latter will serve as an example. This island is three miles in length, and a mile and a third in breadth at its broadest. All the land is held in common by the ten tenants. There are no crofts, therefore no part of the land is held permanently. The tenants meet once a year to decide upon the piece of ground to be broken up for cultivation, and to divide it. To effect this, the constable takes a rod and marks off the land, after which lots are drawn by the

herdsman, who places them one by one in a line on the ground, and this one is the one in which the occupiers of the lots will stand to one another in the shares. These arrangements are carried out quickly and quietly. As the Gaelic proverb says, *Gun ghuth mór gun droch fhacal*, "without a loud voice, without an evil word." A lot called *Imir a Bhuidhe*, "the rig of the herdsman," is generally reserved for the herdsman; it is, as a rule, the outside ridge, bordering on the grazing, to induce him to keep the other ridges safe, as they lie behind it. In English villages, in the Middle Ages, as in Indian villages, at the present day, certain fields were awarded as remuneration to those persons who provided such requisite implements as the agriculturist himself could not supply. In the Gospel, we read of Judas' pieces of silver being employed to purchase "the potter's field." The soldiers and officers of the *in-delta* army in Sweden, receive as a portion of their pay the revenue of a small farm. In Heisgir, a lot is reserved also for the poor, and is called *Imirean nam boc*. Such is the system of *roinn ruith* or *run-rig* in its most archaic form. When the communities break up marshy land for culture, they divide it into narrow strips about five feet wide, and separated by trenches for the purpose of drainage. Often in England one still sees traces of these strips of land or *Baulks*.

The seaweed, which is useful as manure, may be collected by every one when it is deposited on the beach in large quantities, but when the deposit is small, it is divided into *feighinneam* or *pennies* and drawn for in lots, like the land, so that each may have a share, and that the possession of an indispensable article may not be monopolised or seized upon by the strongest or the most agile. The sentiment of distributive justice regulates the division of the means of subsistence and of well-being, even to the very minutest details.

In the island of Tyree, which has belonged for generations to the Duke of Argyll's family, arable land was held and worked on the *run-rig* system, called in Ireland *rundale*. The common parcel of land destined for cultivation was divided into a number of plots for which lots were drawn every one or two years by the cultivators of each agrarian community or township. This system was exceedingly general in the North of Scotland, says the Duke of Argyll, from whom we borrow these details.

"It was, of course," says the Duke, "the interest and duty of proprietors to put an end to this system and by no other agency than proprietary power and right could it have been abolished."—*The Croft and Farms in the Hebrides*. By the Duke of Argyll. Pages 7 and 8.

From a great number of records of the last century we may deduce that the townships system with *run-rig*, or *rundale* as they call it in Ireland, was then everywhere in existence in the Highlands.—(Vide Spence, *Celtic Scotland*, vii. p. 129; iii. pp. 369-71; A. Campbell, *The Grampians Desolate*, 1804, pp. 769-70; Pennant, *Tour in Scotland*, ii. p. 315.)

Now the common possession and administration of rights of pas-

turage constitute the essential characteristic of Highland townships. In this manner an agrarian system which, as far as law is concerned, exists merely as a popular fiction, and as such is tolerated by the proprietor, possesses a reality recognised by custom, and which could not be destroyed without exciting extensive opposition and indignation. The Parliamentary Commissioners add that they are of opinion that this organization of townships, although very rudimentary, possesses certain special advantages, which would tend to avoid special evils and, on the whole, perhaps secure better results than if mere individual interests were called into play. It cannot be denied that the crofters regret the old primitive system which has disappeared principally, as the Duke of Argyle shows, through the action of the landlords and their agents. An Act passed in the year 1695, concerning the division of agrarian communities; was judged applicable to the whole of Scotland, and this considerably facilitated their destruction.

Here are some of the advantages of this collective agrarian ownership, according to the Commissioners' Report. As small cultivators have more land at their command, they can subject it to a system of rotation more in keeping with the rigour of the climate. And on the collective grazing ground, each family could send many more cattle to feed, than on the tiny slip of land now allotted to them. They could more easily dispose of the river, of the moorland, or of the seaweed. They did not live in constant dread of an increase of rent, but felt safe, in a sense of an hereditary right of succession, which procured for them what the law has just granted the Irish tenantry, *security of tenure*.

The Parliamentary Commissioners propose the granting of a legal existence to these townships, so that they may retain their common pasture lands, and ameliorate it and construct roads and bridges, at the common cost, thus imitating the communes of the Continent. In this way a check would be put on the actions of landlords, who have, in many instances, during more than a century and a half, been gradually incorporating portions of these common lands into their own sheep farms. It is proposed that the inhabitants of townships should have the right gratis, to cut turf, collect seaweed for manure, and grass or reeds to repair the roofs of their dwellings. Any township of too restricted proportions shall be permitted to claim from the landlord an additional concession of territory. The sheriff shall decide whether or not this demand be acceded to, and shall fix the rental to be paid to the landlord. No township can under any circumstances be suppressed without the assent of at least two-thirds of its members.

In reply to the objection that it is contrary to economic principles to establish a law opposed to liberty of contract, for the purpose of prolonging the existence of an old-fashioned institution, which must ere long succumb to the natural effects of competition, the Com-

missioners argue that their suggestions are justified by the special conditions of the soil, of the climate, and of agriculture in the Highlands. The working classes and agriculturists cannot rely for food on the cereal crops, which are far too uncertain. They depend for subsistence on their flocks of sheep and cattle. Grazing grounds are therefore absolutely necessary; but the surface of the soil is too irregular and rugged, and vegetation is too backward and too poor in these isles, swept by Atlantic gales, and deprived of the sun by too much rain and fog, for each owner of a plot of ground to possess also separate pasture land, which would also be, in all probability, far up on the mountain. The choice lies, therefore, not between individual or collective grazing-grounds, but between the latter or none at all, and it must not be forgotten that their suppression would imply the utter ruin and enforced emigration of the crofters. In a study on property in the Marche, in Italy, Mr. Ghino Valenti¹ employs precisely the same argument. He proves that communal grazing grounds up on the mountains could only answer as individual property, if they were owned as *latifundia*, by one large proprietor.

In addition to the numerous examples of townships where the collective property periodically experienced redivision, which I cited in my *Primitive Property*, there are many other such examples to be met with in Europe. In an Essay on *Common Fields in Salem*, Professor H. B. Adams mentions that the earliest plantations in the United States were generally common fields administered on the system of the Scottish townships. In an American review, entitled *The Nation* (10 Jan., 1878), there is an article on the remarkable prosperity of the township of the island of Nantucket, where, in spite of the prevalence of great riches, collective property held its ground until 1820. Mr. E. Belot has, more recently, published a pamphlet on this same subject. According to two very distinguished economists, the one Portuguese, M. Oliveira Martins, the other Spanish, M. de Azcaráte, in the Iberian Peninsula, amongst a population whose race, religion, climate, soil, economic conditions are wholly different, the same agrarian system is to be found as with the Highland townships. If traces of this primitive custom are to be met with at points so distant from each other, may we not conclude that it was formerly general? To do this we have but to follow the line of argument of botanists who, when they find the same plants on the Swiss and Norwegian mountains, and not on the plains between, deduct the conclusion that they formerly were also spread over the intermediate regions.

In the examples hitherto mentioned, we have seen the collective régime as a mere declining institution, but throughout Southern Germany it may be met with in full vigour, as also in German

(1) *Atti della Giunta per la Inchiesta Agraria, Provincia di Ancona, Ancoli, Piacenza, Macerata e Pesaro.*

Switzerland, which is more vast than half of England, and where it occupies a most important place, in all rural economy under the name of *Allmend*. This word which is sometimes written *Allmend* is, according to Grimm, derived from *Algemeinde*, "the thing belonging to all." Synonyms full of instruction, the same word *Gemeinde*, in Dutch *Gemeente*, means the political and economic community, in Latin *communitas*. Both the word and the institution it designates may be found more or less well preserved in the entire Germanic world, even as far north as Scandinavia. In Norway the term employed is *Almindingar*, and in Sweden *Almaenning*.

The Allmend is generally composed of forest, meadow, and pasture land (*Wald, Weide und Feld*). The forests provide the inhabitants of the village with wood for fuel and also for building purposes, in case of necessity, and subject to certain specified rules. The arable land is divided among the villagers, sometimes for a space of nine or twelve years, but as a rule for life. The general regulation is that each individual is allowed to turn out on the common pasture all the cattle he has kept at his cost through the winter. The lots of cultivated ground are sometimes all the same size, but in many localities they are most unequal, and when this is the case they are divided into three, four, or five different categories. The youngest members are allotted the lowest category, and then, as the elder ones die off, they rise, step by step, until they, in their turn, attain the first category. In some Allmends, as soon as a young man attains his majority he is provided with a lot, but as a rule he must have a house, or hearth, of his own, *eigenes feuler*, or at all events be a married man. The great disadvantage of this latter system, which has not unfrequently caused it to be abandoned, is that it induces men to marry for the purpose of obtaining a portion of the collective lands. It would perhaps be a means of encouraging an increase of population in those countries where, as in France, this is estimated to be not sufficiently rapid. In some communes certain lots are held in reserve for young couples, and are let until they are allotted. In others, they must wait until the death of an older member leaves a lot ownerless; then all the members mount a step and the newly-married pair commence with one of the smaller lots at the bottom of the ladder. Formerly, no rental whatever was claimed for this land; now a small one is demanded for the purpose of keeping the entire Allmend in a state of proper repair, or, if this be not needed, the money is spent in supplying the general wants of the commune.

In Switzerland the Allmend generally belongs to the descendants

(1) See my book on *Primitive Property*, and more especially with respect to the Allmend in Germany, the interesting chapter by Professor Karl Böhmer, which he added to his translation of it into German, entitled "*Ursprüngliches*." For the Swiss Allmend, see the very complete work of Professor Von Miasowski, *Die Schweizerische Allmend*.

of the original members of the community, who form thus a separate corporation, from which not only mere residents, but even those who have received only the freedom of the city or commune, are excluded. In Germany, and especially in Baden, Hesse, and Wurtemberg, the Allmend is looked upon as the right of all citizens. This is comparatively a modification of the old system, but it is already clamoured for in Switzerland, and the intervention of the Canton legislators is even requested, because the number of inhabitants excluded is ever on the increase.

In old Germanic law, as in Switzerland in the Middle Ages, the right of Allmend went with the dwelling, and was therefore a real right, which was transmitted with the property. It must not be supposed that the Allmend is at all an exceptional institution only to be met with in some few villages lost among the mountains. It exists, on the contrary, in full vigour in the admirably cultivated plain of Basle, and even on the very banks of the Rhine, in Hesse; that is to say, everywhere where the dissolving action of the French Civil Code and the systematic hostility of communal or government authorities, have not enforced its being abandoned. The question has been more than once debated in the Chambers of Baden and Wurtemberg, and the State has already issued general edicts on the subject. This has not been done in Switzerland, where the communal authorities have been hitherto sovereign (*vide* Wurtemberg: Edict for the administration of communes and foundations, March, 1822. Law as to the absolute rights of citizens and communes, 1833. Hesse: Communal regulations, 1832. Baden: Law as to commune and the rights of citizens, 1831. Hohenzollern, 1837). In all this part of Germany not only the peasantry possessing common lands and the different administrations, but also economists such as Rau, Hoffmann and Knaus, were in favour of the preservation of the Allmend, and several wise and well-meaning regulations have corrected mistakes which previously existed, such as the too great splitting up of lots of land, so that the smallest lot must now consist of about two-thirds of an acre.

The extent of the Allmend varies from one locality to another. As a rule the communal forests supply enough wood for fuel for all the families of the village, and in Switzerland the mountains afford sufficient pasturage for very large herds of cattle or goats. The arable land is generally divided into several fields. The nearest home is, as a rule, reserved for fruit and vegetables, and in the others potatoes and cereals are grown. In Germany the cultivated Allmend is of recent origin. It has been formed by the cutting down of forests or the tilling of some meadow land, during the last century, or at the commencement of the present, when the growth of population has necessitated a more intensive system of cultivation and permanent stabulation.

Macrae the two principalities of Hohenzollern, out of 84,000 "morgen"

50,000, or more than three-fifths, belong to the Allmends. Baden is the only country which has published an official statistic of communal property, and this appeared in 1854. We find here that 1,250 communes, that is to say two-thirds of the total number, distributed among the inhabitants in wood alone (523), in wood and arable land (727); 95,000 families received plots of land, the average size of which was about an acre. The size of these plots nevertheless varies very considerably. It is estimated that in 208 communes they are inferior to a Baden morgen, i.e. less than an acre, and this serves merely for a kitchen garden. In 376 communes they vary from one and a half to two morgen; in this case some cereals are cultivated; and in 18 communes the plots vary from seven to ten morgen. The Board of Communal Affairs in the canton of Berne published in 1882 statistics from which we learn that the property owned by the Allmends and Communes in 1880 was worth 102,955,680 francs, although many villages no longer possessed any at all. In Germany even very large communes and towns, situated in the best cultivated and most fertile districts, Heidelberg and Worms for example, still preserve their Allmend.

The advantages of a system of collective communal property appear to me to be very great. In the first place it assures to each family in the village a plot of ground, and thus maintains small landowners. During the early centuries of the Middle Ages the successors of the old chiefs of tribes transformed their political authority into a sort of right of domain of the soil. In Switzerland, on the contrary, the peasantry gradually shook themselves free of the yoke of the great lords, and drove them from the country. They thus reconquered altogether full and complete ownership over the collective territory, and each cultivator secured for himself undisturbed individual possession. In England the reverse took place: the manor destroyed the commune, which no longer exists even in name, and converted the chieftain's limited domain into an unlimited right of proprietorship; much as if Louis XIV. had concluded from the formula that "France belongs to the King," that he had the right to retain all the revenues of all the land for himself.

The Allmend, that is to say, the communal domain, allotted for each one's lifetime, attaches the villager to his village, and prevents the population crowding off to the slums of great cities, thus opposing an obstacle to misery, as each family possesses a lot of arable land where a portion, at least, of its necessary subsistence can be obtained, and which can never be alienated. Is not this far superior to unions and workhouses, which, as in England, provide for the poor? Each individual attached to the *alma parens* in his own commune feels that he has a home. That word possesses a true meaning for him, and the land which he can call his; he is not like the worker without property, for whom the words fatherland and home are mere words, and not realities.

at the present day, mere abstract terms. The members of this old agrarian association, who take part in the administration of the collective domains, serve an apprenticeship for political life, and become in this way accustomed to the direction of public affairs. They are present at deliberations, and are allowed to take part in the debates. They choose their own president, secretary, and keeper; they see the annual accounts given in, which they have the right to discuss and approve or criticise. Thus they become initiated into the mechanism of free institutions, and the administrative aptitude, so necessary to each individual in a democratic country, becomes developed. We must not forget that American democracy also took root in the *township*.

It might be thought that the temporary tenure is less favourable to cultivation than hereditary property. And certainly the latter is the best possible stimulus to labour when the owner himself cultivates; but when land is let, however long the lease may be, the guarantee is less secure than the tenure for life in the Allmend.

There is another more important consideration. Individual property admits of the monopolisation of land, and then tenants become wholly defenceless against the hard law of competition. With communal property divided among all the inhabitants, the land remains in the hands of those who make it yield what it does, which is at once more just and more favourable to social interests. What a contrast between the condition of the inhabitants of a Swiss village and that of the tenants of a village belonging to an English landlord! Certainly many large landed proprietors in England and in Scotland have done much for the improvement of the soil, and invested in it immense capital, which gives them only a very small or no return. But the Swiss peasants enjoy the integral fruits of their labour; they have wood from the forest, hay from the meadows, fish from the streams, and the entire harvests; whereas the Scotch crofters are forced to deliver up the entire net produce of their labour, which is spent in large capitals or abroad. Village communities are a sort of co-operative agricultural societies, which have been preserved since the most primitive ages, and which are based on hereditary customs. The object pursued by certain reformers is therefore attained here.

As the two most eminent politicians of ancient and modern times, Aristotle and Montesquieu, demonstrated, the greatest danger which menaces the maintenance of democracy is the too great inequality of fortunes. Machiavelli expresses this truth very clearly:—"In all republics, when the struggle between patricians and plebeians, between the aristocracy and the people, is at an end, and democracy has gained the upper hand, there remains still a state of opposition, which Macerthorowly with the republic itself—the strife between the rich and the poor—between those who have and those who have not." By in the village a share of the collective estate,

the Allmend prevents excessive inequality opening an abyss between the upper and lower orders of society. The strife between rich and poor cannot, under these circumstances, bring about the ruin of democratic institutions, because no one is very poor and no one very rich. Visit the canton of Unterwalden, or the Black Forest, or Norway; property is in no danger. Why should it be? Who would be likely to threaten it? Every man is himself a landowner. In the United States, in Servia, and in some few other countries, efforts are being made to attain a similar result by the enactment of laws insuring to each family a homestead not liable to seizure or confiscation under any circumstances; but the Allmend is preferable, for as it belongs to the commune, any general ameliorations or improvements are carried out under its direction, and the whole is regularly supervised and kept in proper order.

When private property is concentrated in a few hands, by entail and laws such as in England leave intestate's property to the eldest son, the principle of ownership in land comes to be violently assailed, and levelling legislative measures are proposed, as I have shown in my essay of the Cobden Club volume on *Land Tenure in various Countries*. If, on the contrary, the inheritance is equally divided between all the children, as in France or Belgium, properties may become so cut up that they may be said to crumble to ashes. When the commune regulates divisions it prevents excess in this "chopping-up" process. A limit has been fixed in this way more than once in both Baden and Wurtemberg. Careful cultivation of the Allmend can also be encouraged, on the one hand by offering every year prizes for the plots the best cared for, and on the other by exacting a fine or a diminution of their share from those who have neglected their land.

I do not myself go so far as to believe that the Allmend would prove a complete solution of what is called the social question, for I do not think a receipt exists capable of at once curing humanity of the evils and iniquities with which it is afflicted, and which are the unhappy consequences of a long past of violence, usurpation, and misgovernment. Improvements can only be made slowly and progressively, and it would be an important step in the right direction, if an institution which secures a more equal distribution of property, and opposes an obstacle to pauperism and to agricultural labourers abandoning their villages, were to become generalised. But it will be objected that humanity will not admit of archaic customs, which characterized the earliest days of civilisation, being re-established. My reply to this is that democracy and direct government, which are to all appearance the latest stage attained by the present social evolution, are a mere return to the political organization of primitive societies. *Multa quæ cecidere renascuntur*

EMILE DE

AN OPERATIC CRISIS.

WHAT has become of Italian opera? and how does it happen that this season, for the first time since 1727, and only the second time since the beginning of the eighteenth century, London is without this once favourite form of entertainment? To say that London has, until this season, had performances of Italian opera every year for upwards of a century and a half, is indeed to understate the case. For nearly forty years past, as each new season arrived, the "nobility, gentry and the public," have been accustomed to see Italian opera announced by at least two rival managers; and there have been seasons in which three theatres for the representation of Italian opera have been opened and kept open at the same time. If the collapse of Italian opera had for the last year or two been anticipated, it is certain that some four or five years ago Italian opera in England was prosperous enough. This was shown, indeed, by the budget of the Royal Italian Opera, as published at the time when it was being arranged to hand over the concern to a limited liability company. But inasmuch as for many years past Italian opera in England has received no new element of strength—no new work since *Aida*, no new singer since Albani—it has been gradually, though for a time almost imperceptibly, receiving less attention; until at last the "psychological moment" has arrived at which this fact must have become strikingly apparent to all concerned; to the manager unable to open his theatre, to the singers unable to obtain engagements, and, finally, to the public, deprived of a kind of entertainment to which it had become accustomed and was, under certain conditions, attached.

For some time before its present collapse Italian opera was living more or less satisfactorily on its past reputation. There was a period, no doubt—a period which belongs to history, and which is quite beyond the recollection of the present generation of opera-goers—when, in addition to the character taken by the *prima donna*, all the other parts in an opera were adequately filled. Of late years, however, the manager of an Italian opera company has depended, and, indeed, has had to depend on *prime donne* alone. Apart from criticism, and simply as a matter of fact, no tenor capable of moving an audience has appeared in England since the retirement of Mario, a dozen years ago; and in the absence of tenors capable of the singing with due effect the music intended for them, it became the fashion in many operas to cut such music down—manifestly to the injury of the work as a whole. The tenor parts being thus deprived of such reputation as they had formerly possessed, the public ceased to take the artists in them; and every Italian opera, though originally composed with more generally four—great singers, got to be

looked upon as a one-part opera in connection with which the only point worth considering was—who played the part of the *prima donna*. When Lucia had once gone through her scene of musical madness no one stayed to witness the final performances of the despondent Edgardo; though the scene of his despair and death was at one time looked upon as the most dramatic portion of the opera. M. Soudo, indeed, writing some thirty or forty years ago, in the days when competent Edgardos were more plentiful than competent Lucias, regarded it not only as the composer's finest page, but as one in which, inspired by the situation, he rose above himself and displayed by exception a degree of feeling and power approaching to genius. The interest in Donizotti's opera now comes to an end with the last note sung by the demoted heroine; and similarly the interest of *La Sonnambula* is centred almost exclusively in Amina, that of *Il Barbiere* in Rosina, that of *Rigoletto* in Gilda.

There are other Italian operas which have ceased to be played because, a capable Italian tenor being out of the question, it has been found equally impossible to meet with a *prima donna* possessing enough volume of voice and enough histrionic power to fill such parts as those of Norma and Lucrezia Borgia. Foreign singers have Italianised themselves, of which the result has been to strengthen the *prima donna* department in its lighter subdivisions and to give us such excellent vocalists as Lucca, Nilsson, and Albani. But neither from Italy nor from any other country has come either a "dramatic soprano" qualified by voice and style to sustain such characters as have just been mentioned, or a tenor capable of doing justice to any of the great parts written for the tenor voice. By a curious coincidence, which, however, may in some measure be explained by the ordinary relations between cause and effect, Italy ceased to produce singers just as Italian composers were ceasing to produce operas. Since Grisi and Mario no singer who has attained celebrity in England has been at once of Italian birth and Italian education: though Madame Adelina Patti, half Italian, half Spanish by origin, did, I believe, study in early youth under Italian professors—the place of study, however, being not Milan or Naples, but New York.

Nor since Verdi finished his career with *Aida*, has any opera brilliant enough and powerful enough to delight audiences in all parts of the civilised world been brought out. That is what an opera to fulfil its natural function, ought really to do. Berlioz described music as "the art of moving intelligent men by means of sequences and combinations of sounds;" an excellent definition, excluding alike strains that are frivolous and harmonies that are merely learned. So at least it would seem until we ask ourselves what by the words "intelligent men" Berlioz really meant. The definition leaves us in doubt as to what the words "intelligent men" signify. Sir Wm. Gowers; the something more than an intelligent man. But, seeing that since

music he could only be "moved" by airs which he regarded as Scotch. Sydney Smith was an intelligent man. But he declares in one of his essays that he would not sit out an oratorio "except under sentence of a British jury;" and he has elsewhere observed that what irritates him so much in music is not so much the noise as the evident malice with which this noise has been prepared and combined beforehand. The intelligent Alexandre Dumas held that "of all noises music is the most disagreeable." Innumerable cases might, indeed, be cited of men of "intelligence," including intelligence of a very high kind, in connection with literary art, to whom music either said nothing, or said what they would rather not hear. Berlioz's definition can all the same be made generally serviceable, if we take it for granted that when he spoke of intelligent men he meant intelligent men capable of being affected by those "sequences and combinations of sounds" which, in cases of genuine music, were to "move" them; and whether this be or be not, the test of genuine music, it is really the test of a good opera.

An opera, like a drama, has in every case been written for the public; chiefly, it may be hoped, for the more intelligent portion of it, but in any case for the public as a whole. An opera may possess great musical merits, and yet not please the public; and every one knows that many operas which have delighted the public for years and years in every part of Europe are looked upon by severe musicians with a feeling which might be described as contempt, did not that word imply the view held by a superior towards persons and things beneath him. The error in this case (for error there obviously is) arises from music written for a special dramatic purpose being treated as music composed for its own sake. Many dramas and comedies which, equally with *Il Trovatore* and *La Traviata*, have found their way all over Europe (no drama or comedy, by the way, has ever attained nearly so much popularity as the most popular of Verdi's operas), are of very doubtful value as literature, though excellent as stage plays; and similarly it may be said of all Italian operas still performed—written for the most part between the years 1830 and 1865—that, however little title they may have to be regarded as monuments of learning and art, they have served their purpose as musical dramas. More than this might be claimed for them, if only in virtue of such pieces as the concerted *finale* to the second act of *Lucia*, the *Miserere* scene in *Il Trovatore*, the quartet in *Rigoletto*, and the quintet in *Un Ballo in Maschera*. Nor ought it to be forgotten that one of the high-priests of the musical sect which cries anathema upon all operas but those of Wagner, has for a long series of years shown his appreciation of the most popular Italian operas by drawing from them for his republique and brilliant fantasias their most striking themes. It is in the aristocratic Italian opera and its collapse that we are dealing; and in the upper various causes that, for a time at least, have brought

that description of entertainment to an end, it is scarcely necessary to inquire at this late day into its artistic value. Its defects, and even from a certain point of view (which is not that of the public) its absurdities have often been pointed out. But it is not by reason of any critical objection to them on the part of audiences that in London as in Paris, works of this kind are for the present no longer played.

All operas are of necessity based on certain conventions which seem ridiculous to those who are not sufficiently moved by the music to accept them. But though in most Italian operas the singers are studied too much and the subject too little—dramatic effect being thus sacrificed to flowing melodies and opportunities for vocalisation—it is certain all the same that, with a Patti, a Mario, an Alboni, a Tamburini, and a Lablache to support it, a favourite Italian opera of Verdi, of Donizetti, or even of the more antiquated Rossini, would draw larger houses now than ever. This may be inferred on the soundest arithmetical principles, from the immense audiences attracted by the most familiar works of the old Italian repertory, with no part adequately impersonated except the one undertaken by Madame Adelina Patti.

One would think at a first glance that the condition of an art must be flourishing in proportion to the incomes earned by its professors. Yet, in connection with Italian opera, the highest salaries ever known have been paid during the last two years, when Italian opera was on the point of breaking down. Four hundred pounds a night to Madame Patti in England, eight hundred pounds (exclusive of a merely nominal fee of eighty pounds a night to her business agent) in the United States, testified to the highly exceptional value of Madame Patti's talents—consequent in a great degree upon their rarity. Two hundred pounds a night—the lowest figure at which, up to the time of the collapse, a *prima donna* of the first rank, next only in pre-eminence to Madame Patti, would consent to appear—was, until a very few years ago, thought sufficient even by Madame Patti herself; whose terms, however, have been raised (have, to be just, been raised for her by rival speculators) as singers of the highest merit have become more and more difficult to meet with: her own superiority becoming in this manner more and more marked. Thus, as before observed, the decline of Italian opera has had the effect of sending up in inverse ratio the salaries of Italian vocalists.

It is not, indeed, the taste for Italian opera that has died out so much as Italian opera itself; performances of Italian lyric dramas by Italians or thoroughly Italianised vocalists, having become less and less adequate, until at last the whole fabric has given way. The attraction of the *prima donna* among *prime donne* was genuine and substantial to the last. She drew, that is to say, from the public (and least in England) more even than she received from the manager, seeing that the interest of the representation in which she appeared, was not treated in her alone; and the carelessness of the managers to pass without

represented was justified by the imperfect style in which all the parts but that of the *prima donna* were sung.

Oddly enough, the collapse of Italian opera in England has, in rather an instructive manner, been accompanied by a similar collapse in France; where, after a career of nearly a century, dating from the revolutionary year of 1789, it was brought to a sudden stop by the disasters of 1870. After a time attempts were made to revive it, but on an incomplete basis, and without success; and last winter the curious spectacle was to be witnessed at Paris of an Italian Opera at which the chief, indeed the sole, attraction was a tenor entirely unsupported; just as some months before in London an Italian opera had been carried on in which the *prima donna* element was strikingly unduly prominent. In each case there was remarkable poverty of singers; and this in connection with works composed with a special view to from three to five vocalists—generally four—of the highest gifts and acquirements. Operas expressly written for, say, Grisi, Mario, Tamburini, and Lablache do not enjoy a fair chance when in London they are given with no part perfectly filled but that of the *prima donna*; in Paris with no part filled with anything like adequacy but that of the tenor.

There is, indeed, no reason whatever for supposing that the most familiar of Italian operas—*Norma*, for instance, *La Sonnambula*, *Lucia* and *Lucrezia Borgia*, *Il Trovatore* and *La Traviata*—not to mention such undeniably dramatic works in a newer style as *Rigoletto*, *Un Ballo in Maschera*, and finally *Aida*—will not for years to come prove greatly attractive if vocalists can only be found to sing them as they should be sung. Every one knows them; every opera-goer knows them by heart. As much, however, can be said of numbers of old plays which still please—please, indeed, as much as ever when they are well acted; but which interpreted by bad actors or by an insufficient number of good ones, cannot possibly attract an audience. The *School for Scandal*, with no part in it well filled but that of Lady Teazle, would indeed be a worse entertainment by a good deal than *Il Barbiere* with Madame Putti as Rosina and no one worth mentioning in any of the other characters; though the dialogue of Sheridan, like the music of Rossini (above all in the *Barber*), has only to be uttered correctly in order in some measure to produce its effect.

There are some popular Italian operas which, unlike *Il Barbiere* in the comic and *Aida* in the serious style, are worth very little as music; not very much more, for example, than the *Lady of Lyons*—nevertheless, an admirable acting play—is worth considered as literature. Those, however, which still hold the stage are certainly far above this not very high artistic level; and putting criticism—or, in other words, the expression of personal opinion—on one side, the permanent reputation achieved by some dozen or more of these works in various the aristocratic seems to prove in a positive manner their substantial value. The only number of "intelligent men" in different places have been "moved" by them. What capital is

there in which even the much hackneyed (also for reasons above mentioned, much mutilated) *Sonnambula* would not cause general enthusiasm if the part of Anima could be played again by a second Malibran, the part of Elvino by a second Rubini?

Although what goes in London by the name of "Italian opera" includes representations of French and even German operas by artists who, singing in the Italian language, are for the most part not Italian, this entertainment in its purest form consists of Italian operas sung by Italian singers. It has never been restricted to works composed by Italians nor to singers of Italian nationality. Handel, Hasse, Gluck, Mozart, and in our own day Meyerbeer, composed Italian operas; operas, that is to say, founded on Italian *libretti* and treated in accordance with Italian forms. Sontag, too, a German, and Malibran, a Spaniard, are classed with the most illustrious Italian singers; they had, in fact, formed themselves in the Italian school, and they made their reputation by singing in Italian works. But from the time of Rossini Italian opera in Italy, and wherever Italian opera had become established abroad—as in London, Paris, St. Petersburg, Vienna, Dresden, and Madrid—consisted almost entirely of works by Italians; Rossini supplanting all his predecessors to be himself before long, not supplanted but supported by his imitators, Donizetti and Bellini; to whom was afterwards to be joined the last of his school—the composer of the greatest serious opera that it has produced. Verdi's *Aida* may possibly mark the end of Italian opera. It at least marks an entire cessation in the productiveness of Italian composers, counting, of course, those only who, like Rossini, Bellini, Donizetti, and Verdi, have appealed to the whole world and found in every civilised country willing and enthusiastic audiences.

If the collapse of Italian opera has been caused mainly by the disappearance of really competent Italian singers, the termination of the line of Italian composers who for fifty years (from the beginning of Rossini's until the end of Verdi's career) were constantly giving to Italian opera; through new works, new life must also be counted for something, and even for a great deal. If another *Aida*, *Ballo in Maschera*, or *Rigoletto* could be written, managers would seek everywhere for singers capable of representing the new work in a worthy manner; and as the honour of appearing in it would also be eagerly sought for, it would probably be found possible to bring together for the occasion a *prima donna*, a tenor, a baritone, and a bass of a sufficiently high order. This is what Verdi actually did for his *Aida* and his *Requiem*, when the dearth of capable singers was already beginning to make itself felt. Italian opera is really, however, in the position of the English drama not very many years ago, when some said if there were no new plays it was because there were no poets to write for; others that if there were no great actors there were no new plays for them to appear in.

Europe a perfect company of Italian vocalists waiting for a new Italian opera in which to display their talents; nor (in spite of vague, inconsistent reports, about a new version of *Othello*, on which Verdi has for some years past been said to be engaged) is there any reason to believe that a new Italian opera, whether by a recognised master or by a student of great promise, is on its side waiting for singers and an opportunity of being performed. Capable Italian singers, however, if they could only be found in sufficient numbers, would still be able to get on for some considerable time longer without new operas; whereas composers would find it very difficult, except now and then for a special occasion, to get any new work properly sung. This, for instance, would have been impossible last winter in Paris, and equally so last summer in London.

When, some twenty or five-and-twenty years ago, Verdi's vein seemed gradually getting exhausted (not that his later works are inferior to his earlier ones—quite the contrary—but because he now produced only at long intervals), Italian managers turned to France and Germany for new works. Germany had, in the way of serious works, given Italian opera—that is to say opera in general, the opera that makes its way all over the world—only three productions: *Zauberflöte*, *Fidelio*, and *Der Freischütz*. German composers, through Italy and through France, had of course contributed to Italian and Italianised opera some of its finest works: Mozart's two Italian masterpieces, for example, and no less than six operas composed by Meyerbeer for the Académie and the Opéra Comique of Paris. But *Die Zauberflöte*, *Fidelio*, and *Der Freischütz* remained the only three works adopted into Italian opera from the German stage, until about five-and-twenty years ago a work of very inferior calibre, the un-Germanlike *Martha*, was added to the number. The Italians had already taken from the French Auber's *Muette de Portici*; and they next Italianised for their own purposes two of his lighter operas, *Fra Diavolo* and *Les Diamants de la Couronne*. In Gounod's *Faust* they found a treasure; and in default of operas by Italian composers they now looked to Gounod, Ambroise Thomas, and Massenet for new works, and—without much looking—found again a treasure in the *Carmen* of Bizet. In *Mefistofele*, the first, and apparently the last work of its composer, the Italian companies obtained once more an Italian work; not, it is true, very Italian in style, but the authentic work of an Italian composer, written for an Italian company and produced at an Italian theatre—where, by the way, on the occasion of its first performance, it was violently hissed. Apart from this opera, which, though very impressive in parts, does not seem to have left a permanent mark, the Italian companies have, since *Aida*, turned for their novelties almost entirely on French composers; and for some twenty years they have been indebted to France for a dozen operas, including three striking successes—*Les Huguenots*, *Les Maîtres de Chanson*, and *Les Femmes de Alceste*, of which *Faust* and *Carmen* must

ed among the greatest operatic successes of these latter works have, together with *Mignon*, and English as well as Italian; and they have all many and Italy the same applause with which, Italian or English companies, they have con- veyed in England. These three operas were all England by the companies either of Her Majesty's the Royal Italian Opera; so that Italian opera seems, moment of its disappearance, to have done good by making to our public works with which it might otherwise have been for some time unacquainted. Mr. Carl Rosa, however, has just shown us that a work of merit can pass direct from the French to the English operatic stage without Italian intervention; and really, when there is a question of presenting a French opera to an English public, there seems no valid reason why the presentation should be effected through singers of various nationalities in imitations, more or less perfect, of the language of Italy. We are supposing, of course, that the translated French work would be quite as well sung on the English as on the Italian stage. Otherwise all that has been said on the subject falls of course to the ground.

But that the Pattis, the Nilssons, the Albanis, the Luccas, the Gersters will abandon the Italian stage, and the habit of singing in a language which is that of so many operatic establishments in various parts of the world, is surely improbable. We hear still of singers foreign to Italy studying in that country with a view to the Italian stage; and a clever young American lady writing of what she really knows has told us, in a story of operatic life, of the number of American girls who rush annually to Milan, in order to prepare themselves for the brilliant and lucrative profession of *prima donna*. The ambition to become a *prima donna* and earn four hundred pounds a night (eight hundred—with an additional eighty for an agent—in the United States) is one that is also entertained in England; and there is probably no continental country in which it is not cultivated. It seems probable, then, that with so many working towards the same goal some will more or less nearly approach it. It may be presumed, too, that in innumerable schools, academies, and colleges of music established in all parts of Europe there are even now students who will some day distinguish themselves as composers. This, however, is the merest speculation. For the present there is more to be hoped from Mr. Goring Thomas and Mr. Mackenzie than from any of the Italian composers who have yet come before the English public; more, for instance, than from Marchetti, the composer of *Ruy Blas*, or Ponchielli, the composer of *La Gioconda*; more even from Boito, the composer of *Mefistofele*, seeing that since he has allowed so many years to pass without pro-

Neither *Nadeshda*, however, nor *Emeralda*, nor

way help towards setting up again the fallen opera, in spite of vague, insignificant, on which Verdi has done by means of some very striking work, quite there any reason to a work which should cause in Italy the kind of recognised master or by a often been produced there by the operas of Rossini, singers and an opera and Verdi, but never by the work of a foreigner. However, if they hoping, perhaps even for believing, that such a composer be able to get come; though there is for the present no sign whatever of such a composer.

Some dozen years ago there seemed to be just a chance that special opera might in a measure be revived through the influence of Wagner, though it was its destruction, not its preservation—far less its revival when once it should be dead—that Wagner in his writings seemed to have in view. *Lohengrin* was produced in Italy, and the applause with which it was received showed that the Italians were still capable of appreciating musical beauty in every form. In England, where everything of Wagner's has been performed—from *Rienzi* and the *Flying Dutchman* to the *Ring des Nibelungen* and (without dramatic surroundings), *Parsifal*—*Lohengrin* seems alone to have made a permanent impression on opera-goers. But this impression is due to the performances given in Germany under the direction of Herr Richter, rather than to those which took place at the Royal Italian Opera and at Her Majesty's Theatre; and when Italian opera is revived in this country, as before long it cannot fail to be, it may be doubted whether, of the various foreign works introduced into the Italian repertory, even *Lohengrin* will be found one of the most attractive. The music of Wagner, scarcely appreciated by our ordinary operatic audiences, has made its mark in England chiefly through the admirable concerts of Herr Richter, where it is presented in the form of pieces specially prepared for the concert-room. Symphonic music is to the music of most operas what literature is to the dialogue to be met with in most dramas. The composer of symphonies may be a great musician, but quite incapable of entering into the spirit of a dramatic subject; of giving force to situations, character to personages, and colour to scenes. The operatic composer, on the other hand, without being a great musician, may possess the very qualities in which we have supposed the composer of symphonies to be wanting. Some few composers of the highest class have been at once great musicians and consummate musical dramatists; and examples of the poet and the dramatist combined in one person may similarly be found among writers. But as the serious student of literature is more often to be found in the library and the lecture-room than at the theatre, so the serious student of music frequents the concert-room rather than the opera-house. The two are no doubt, are sisters; but they are sisters who do not always see eye to eye. The earnest lovers of symphonic music care little for Italian opera, and regard it as trivial; while the majority of opera-goers know little of symphonic music, but have a hazy notion that it is dull.

